DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 406 519 CE 073 587

AUTHOR	Spangenberg, Gail
TITLE	Even Anchors Need Lifelines. Public Libraries in Adult Literacy.
SPONS AGENCY	Library of Congress, Washington, DC. Center for the Book.
PUB DATE	Aug 96
NOTE	469p.
PUB TYPE	Numerical/Quantitative Data (110) -- Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC19 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Basic Education; *Adult Literacy; Educational Research; Educational Technology; Futures (of Society); Librarian Attitudes; Library Administrators; Library Planning; Library Policy; *Library Role; *Library Services; *Literacy Education; *Public Libraries; State Federal Aid; Technological Advancement
IDENTIFIERS	*State Literacy Resource Centers

ABSTRACT

This report, in two volumes, is a study of the role and future of public libraries in adult literacy that involved a survey of 200 professionals--state librarians, state library literacy contacts, heads of state literacy resource centers (SLRCs), and local library literacy program heads. The first volume describes the study findings in seven sections: mission and role of public libraries in adult literacy provision; use and limits of technology; the planning context of library literacy programs; financial and funding questions; state-level data collection issues; local program issues; and lifeblood issues and leadership. Section 8 presents conclusions and recommendations, including the following: 70% of state respondents believe adult literacy should be a major public library mission; only 50% of state libraries have major adult literacy involvement; lack of funding is the major obstacle to technology use; SLRCs have been largely underfunded; permanent loss of federal funding for library literacy would close many programs; bold state and national leadership is essential; and the single most urgent issue is funds and funding stability. A participant list is appended. Volume II is a data book organized into the eight topical sections of the survey. The contents page for each section indicates the questions as well as the survey groups to which particular questions were addressed. Data are presented in tables or as free response answers. (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 406 519

EVEN ANCHORS NEED LIFELINES

Public Libraries In Adult Literacy

A Study by Gail Spangenberg
Spangenberg Learning Resources

New York City
August 1996

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
S. Spangenberg
Center for the Book
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

CS073587

Sponsored by
The Center for the Book
in The Library of Congress

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PREFACE

The Center for the Book in the Library of Congress is pleased to make this study, *Even Anchors Need Guidelines: Public Libraries in Adult Literary*, available to a wide public.

The Center for the Book was established by law in 1977 to stimulate public interest in books, reading, and libraries. A small, catalytic office that depends on funds from outside the Library of Congress for its program and publications, it is pleased to acknowledge support for this project from the National Institute for Literacy, Harold W. McGraw, Jr., McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc., and the American Library Association. For advice and support, thanks also go to members of the center's reading promotion network of affiliated state centers and national educational and civic organizations.

Even Anchors Need Guidelines is an important study. The Center for the Book looks forward to continuing the discussions it will provoke.

John Y. Cole
Director

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The research underlying *Even Anchors Need Lifelines* makes one fact crystal clear: Though too little recognized and appreciated, public library adult literacy services are a vital part of the national adult literacy system, serving hundreds of thousands of adult Americans in thousands of programs across the country.

It also underscores a bizarre irony: Just as they have become an established force in literacy, public library literacy programs find themselves poised at the edge of a financial precipice. Earmarked federal funding for them has been cut. And there are very grave doubts that they will be able to compete for education or literacy funds provided through state block grants.

This report thus begins and ends on an uncertain note. It can turn out to be the postmortem for a major part of the public library adult literacy field. Or it can be the spark that ignites the imagination and action so urgently needed to preserve that field and lay a base for developing its future role. Which it will be depends on what state librarians, public libraries and library associations, adult literacy groups, public and private funding agencies, and political leaders decide to do about the main findings and recommendations. In particular, it depends on what they are prepared to do *immediately* about the funding crisis that confronts the public libraries.

This report is organized into seven sections, each focused on a single area of research, and an eighth section (beginning on page 116) which contains the main conclusions and 19 priority recommendations.

Two recommendations in Section 8 address the most urgent funding need. One calls for the prompt restoration of earmarked funding for library literacy programming—at the federal level, in state block grants, or both. The other challenges the philanthropic community to help meet the short-term funding need so that professionals and programs in the field can maintain their balance while planning for the future.

Gail Spangenberg

Since 1993, through Spangenberg Learning Resources, Gail Spangenberg has directed a variety of studies and organizational planning and development projects. Her clients have included such diverse groups as Chemical Bank, U.S. Basics, The DeWitt Wallace-Reader's Digest Fund, the British Broadcasting Corporation, the Hewlett Foundation, New York Theatre Ballet, and the U.S. Department of Education. In 1994, for the Library's new President, she conducted a study of the New York Public Library's adult literacy program.

In the early 1980s, Ms. Spangenberg helped establish the Business Council for Effective Literacy and as its Vice President and Operating Head from 1983 to 1993 she was responsible for development and management of BCEL's policies, publications, and other adult literacy programs and services.

Before that she was Program Officer and Consultant to the Ford Foundation and Senior Consultant to Carnegie Corporation and the Russell Sage Foundation. At Ford, she had responsibility for grant programs in nontraditional and urban higher education, adult education and literacy, and educational technology. She developed the Ford Foundation project which produced McGraw-Hill's book *Adult Illiteracy In America*, by Carmen St. John Hunter and David Harman. She also spearheaded Ford's involvement in the BBC's pioneering national adult literacy campaign in the United Kingdom.

In the early 1980s she developed a major paper on adult literacy for the Carnegie Corporation, and for the Russell Sage Foundation she developed and implemented a range of management and computer systems, including that organization's social science research library and information services.

Ms. Spangenberg has served on many state and national literacy task forces, planning committees, and advisory boards, including the Definition Committee of the National Adult Literacy Survey conducted by the Educational Testing Service and the U.S. Department of Education, the ESL Adult Literacy Clearinghouse of the Center for Applied Linguistics, the U.S. Office of Technology Assessment's 1990 study titled *Worker Training: Competing in the New International Economy*, and numerous studies of workplace literacy for the Southport Institute for Policy Analysis. In her position at BCEL, she commissioned the Southport Institute study which led to creation of the National Literacy Act.

Spangenberg Learning Resources can be reached at 440 East 23rd Street, Ste. 11C, New York, NY 10010. Phone: 212-677-8656. E-mail: GSpan1@AOL.com.

INTRODUCTION

THE CONTEXT

After more than a decade of solid advances in policy development, research, and service outreach, the movement against adult functional illiteracy in the U.S. appears to be in retreat.

School-to-work transition efforts and family literacy have been the steady focus of the present administration, but other components on the adult literacy spectrum have faded from attention.

Furthermore, federal literacy funding for many strands of adult literacy (homeless programs, workplace literacy partnerships, and state literacy resource centers) has evaporated almost overnight, and more setbacks are likely, especially if state block grants are implemented.

The retreat is alarming and philosophically hard to justify, for regardless of the political lens through which one looks, an extensive accumulation of evidence attests to a powerful connection between the basic skills proficiency of Americans and the well-being of America.

The current climate makes it hard, in some ways impossible, to plan effectively for the future of adult literacy. And matters are made even worse by government down-sizing and ideological warfare on the political front. The result is that a growing number of adult literacy programs —long used to inadequate funding—are limping along as never before toward financial disaster—and adult literacy professionals are increasingly frustrated and discouraged.

It would be natural in the current hostile atmosphere for literacy planners and practitioners to take a wait-and-see approach. But that would *guarantee* even more losses, and there is simply too much at stake for that to be acceptable. Indeed, the very forces that make it hard to stand and fight make it imperative to do just that.

Determination, rededication, and boldness of vision are needed as never before. So is openness to forging new liaisons, developing new voices, and finding opportunity in established avenues of service whose full potential has not yet been used.

WHY THIS STUDY?

This library literacy study stems from a belief that the community-based public libraries are one of the strongest anchors for literacy education the nation could possibly have.

Public libraries have an organic presence in nearly every American town and city, ranking right up there with the local post office and the community college. They are deeply imbedded in the general public consciousness and have a permanence that many other organizations don't have.

Furthermore, it isn't hard to see that their reading and information services increasingly require a literate community of users. In fact, it has been argued since the turn of the century that it is in the best interest of public libraries, the general public they serve, *and* adult basic education for adult literacy services to be a central part of their mission. Indeed, in announcing this study, the executive director of the American Library Association declared that this educational service role "adds to the richness and relevance of libraries in communities throughout America."

But it would be folly to advocate a stronger adult literacy role for public libraries without better understanding what they are already doing, what they think about that, and what factors will shape their current and future role.

How *do* state and local public libraries currently view the role of their institutions in adult basic education and literacy? What connections and understandings exist between public libraries and state and national planning groups, especially the state literacy resource centers legislated to have a central role in setting the statewide context? What does actual public library involvement consist of now? What problems do state libraries and local public library literacy programs face as they look to the future? How well positioned *are* public libraries to take a stronger role in adult literacy service provision? What can be done to help them do this, assuming enough people agree that the goal is worthy?

Even Anchors Need Lifelines does not pretend to have complete answers to these questions. In fact, it will probably raise more questions than it answers. But the hope is that it will spark a new and more realistic appreciation of what the possibilities are and what work needs to be done to develop the public library role.

SPONSORS & ADVISORS

This study was sponsored by The Center for the Book in The Library of Congress. It took place during a nine-month period between September 1995 and May 1996.

Grant support was provided by the National Institute for Literacy ($11,000), Harold W. McGraw, Jr. ($11,000), McGraw-Hill Companies Inc. ($9,500), and the American Library Association ($5,000). Center for the Book costs were somewhere in the vicinity of $15,000 excluding publication expenses. Spangenberg Learning Resources donated major staff and material resources to the undertaking.

Many people from across the country contributed their time and thinking to this report. There is hardly anything in it that is not theirs. They are acknowledged in Appendices A-C.

General acknowledgments are presented in Appendix A. Appendix B lists the people who served in various project advisory roles. Many wrote memoranda to assist with data analysis, and their thinking will be evident throughout the report. Appendix C lists the names and addresses of the nearly 200 professionals who provided the raw material for this study by filling out questionnaires. To facilitate networking, phone and fax numbers as well as e-mail addresses are given for Appendix B and C contributors.

THE WORK PLAN

Following an initial definition period, the survey and analysis portion of this study unfolded in a series of four discrete phases—interspersed with meetings, tracking of legislation, interviews, and other activities.

Phase 1 - questionnaire design and mailing list development. In September and October, questionnaires of varying length were designed, sent out for review, and customized for four different target groups: **chief officers of state library agencies (state librarians)...designated literacy contacts in those same state library agencies ...heads of state literacy resource centers...and local library literacy programs.**

Name and address lists were obtained from several sources as were nominations for local programs. The lists were found to be largely out of date, requiring extensive up-front telephone work to verify names, titles, and addresses.

The questionnaire for state librarians (Q1) consisted of five pages of general questions to probe their present thinking about the role of public libraries in adult literacy, and about matters of technology use, involvement in state planning, and various funding and financial matters.

The questionnaire for state library agency literacy professionals (Q2, ten pages) included the same five pages sent to the state librarians plus five more. This was done to elicit more deeply detailed information and to learn whether state library agencies collect meaningful program data about local public library literacy programs.

In the main, Q1 and Q2 aimed to assess whether these important state agencies are providing significant leadership and support to local library literacy programs, and whether they could be a source of strong, new leadership as federal funding and power shifts to the states.

State Literacy Resource Centers were included as a third study strand (Q3, ten pages) because they were presumed to be the centrally important state level planning and resource entities envisioned in the National Literacy Act of 1991. As such, it was reasoned, they would have a key role in shaping the context in which public library literacy programs operate, a role that should be understood better.

Some questions designed for SLRCs had to do with their perceptions about the status of public libraries as part of the statewide system for delivering adult literacy services. Others sought to examine the current and potential role and health of the SLRCs themselves.

In the fourth questionnaire for local library literacy programs (Q4, eight pages), some questions were the same as those asked of the first three groups while others were devoted to the specific purposes, features, and problems of the programs themselves. The primary goal was to discover the concerns and hopes of those who actually provide the services.

Questionnaires were sent to 82 local public library literacy programs in 32 states. The 63 responding programs are not a national sampling, but their experiences and circumstances are especially relevant because they are long established (9.9 years on average), are known to have solid track records, and have a valuable accumulation of insights.

They were either nominated by national or state leadership organizations or selected by Spangenberg Learning Resources from three sources: research reports found in the ERIC database, the large pool of programs that have had multiple-year funding from the Office of Education Research & Improvement of the U.S. Department of Education, and programs reported on in various newsletters of the Business Council for Effective Literacy.

An effort was made to have geographic distribution and to include both small and large population areas.

Phase 2 - questionnaire production and mailing. During October and November, reproduction and color-coding of the questionnaires took place, letters of transmittal were written, and mailings went out. Additional literature was reviewed and telephone consultations were made.

Phase 3 - telephone follow-up and other communications activities. To improve the response rate—and it did—extensive telephone follow-up occurred during December and January. Questionnaire returns were sorted and given preliminary review. Duplicate questionnaires were provided as necessary and clarifying consulations were held with many respondents.

Phase 4 - data synthesis and analysis. From February to May, data organization and analyses were done. In March, the data were prepared and sent to a panel of project advisors for review.

In addition, telephone interviews and informational calls were made to several national organizations: the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, the American Library Association, the U.S. Department of Education, the National Institute for Literacy, the Center for Applied Linguistics, the Public Library Data Service of the ALA, the National Clearinghouse for Adult Literacy/ESL Education, the National Center for Family Literacy, Laubach Literacy Action, and Literacy Volunteers of America.

PRESENTATION & OUTCOMES

An immense amount of information was collected in this project. Over 2,000 pages of raw material were generated. That was boiled down to a data book of nearly 321 pages, which in turn was reduced to the 51 tables seen in this report. Every question asked in the survey is covered here, along with a parallel discussion and analysis of the responses.

The report is dense and too much to digest in a single reading. But it has been written to be read as easily as possible. Each section is self-contained and can be read apart from all the others, depending on the reader's interest. It can also be navigated with little attention to the tables or examined in a deeply studied way.

The reader can also begin at the end, with the Conclusions and Recommendations section starting on page 116. The main findings for each section are summarized there.

Sections 1-6 deal in turn with the broad themes of the survey. Section 7 gives direct voice to the respondents themselves. It recaps and reinforces the analysis and findings discussed in 1-6. As noted, the main findings are presented in Section 8, along with conclusions and recommendations.

Q1	69% (35) of the state librarians themselves sent in completed returns. 24% (12) said that their agency's designated literacy contact speaks for them (CA, CO, LA, MA, MO, NY, OK, SC, VT, VA, WA, and WY). 8% (4) did not want to participate (AK, AZ, CT, NC).
Q2	85% (44) of state library agency literacy contacts responded. 14% (7) did not respond (AL, AZ, DC, NC, NV, RI, UT).
Q3	78% (40) of state literacy resource center heads (or their equivalents) responded. 22% (11) did not respond (AR, DC, GA, ID, MA, ME, NV, OR, RI, TX, WY).
Q4	77% (63) of the 82 nominated local public library literacy programs responded. 23% (19) did not respond (one arrived too late to be included).

The report sections are as follows:

1. **The Public Library's Role** (p. 6)
2. **The Use & Limits Of Technology** (p. 18)
3. **Planning** (p. 35)
4. **Finance & Funding** (p. 48)
5. **State Level Program Data** (p. 61)
6. **Local Programs: The Heart Of The Matter** (p. 72)
7. **Lifeblood Issues & Leadership** (p. 89)
8. **Conclusions & Recommendations** (p. 116)

Appendices (p. 126)

It should be noted that severe budget constraints placed major limits on this project. Detailed state-by-state comparisons, for instance, could not be performed—although such analysis is possible and would be useful and even necessary for some purposes.

For those who want to undertake deeper analyses of the findings, the complete study data will be published as a supplement to the report called *Even Anchors Need Lifelines: The Background Data.*

In addition, the Center for the Book may eventually issue some targeted resource publications for the field that draw on material in this report.

SETTING THE STAGE

For this study, adult literacy is defined as ***basic reading, writing, math, and ESL needed by adults to function in various contexts. Included are workplace/workforce literacy and family literacy (where the focus of instruction is on parents)***. The definition is consistent with that of the National Literacy Act.

The four groups questioned in the 50 states and the District of Columbia—chief officers of state library agencies, key literacy contacts in state libraries, heads of state literacy resource centers, and directors of local library literacy programs— are referred to either by those designations or Q1, Q2, Q3, and Q4. This short-hand device was used in the full data book and is retained here to faciliate cross-referencing.

As the table above shows, the study achieved an extraordinarily high

> This assemblage of data is remarkable, giving us information about library literacy programs incomparably more extensive and meaningful than we have ever had before. (Dan Lacy, Duke University, formerly of BCEL & McGraw-Hill, Inc.)
>
> It is significant to have this much raw data in one place. It would have been useful to have this 5 to 10 years ago when the discussion of the role of libraries in literacy began to intensify. (Bridget Lamont, State Librarian, IL)

response rate—especially from the state library personnel. That is an important finding in itself, indicating a deep interest in the topic under study.

Although it took extensive staff work to produce such a strong response, the rate is nonetheless remarkable. These are very busy people in the best of economic times, and when this survey reached their desks they were unusually concerned about their institutions and programs —and still are—because of federal and state cutbacks.

Moreover, it was a real eye-opener to discover the extent to which project questionnaires had to compete with literally dozens of questionnaires from other sources—almost a public policy issue in itself.

The recipients in all groups are deluged with survey forms, day in and day out, from every imaginable source— for purposes that range from the grand to the frivolous. Most are trashed on arrival, and those kept for later attention are routinely relegated to the bottom of the work pile where they are apt to be forgotten. Yet several people contacted during follow-up were grateful to be reminded because they genuinely *wanted* to participate.

It is worthy of note, too, that if the response rate for state literacy resource centers actually seems *low* given their presumed role—why not a 100% response rate here, asked one data reviewer—one of the most shocking things learned in the study is that at the time the data were being gathered, many SLRCs had already been forced by federal funding cuts to close or drastically curtail operations. The circumstances of most SLRCs remain very bleak. It is a story that needs attention in its own right.

1: THE PUBLIC LIBRARY'S ROLE

R1: Should the provision of literacy services be a major mission of public libraries? [Asked of groups Q1-Q4]

		Yes	No	Not Sure
Q1	State Librarians (35 of 35)	66%	26%	9%
Q2	State Library Literacy Contacts (37 of 44)	81	8	11
Q3	State Literacy Resource Center Heads (38 of 40)	74	16	11
Q4	Local Library Literacy Program Heads (63 of 63)	91	6	3

R2: Are public library literacy programs a major component of your state's literacy-providing network now? [Q3-Q4]

		Yes	No	Not Sure
Q3	SLRC Heads (38 of 40)	53%	42%	5%
Q4	Local Program Heads (63 of 63)	62	25	13

R3: Is the development of library-based adult literacy programs a major mission of the state library agency now? [Q1-Q4]

		Yes	No	Not Sure
Q1	State Librarians (35 of 35)	51%	43%	6%
Q2	State Library Literacy Contacts (36 of 44)	50	44	6
Q3	SLRC Heads (38 of 40)	29	55	16
Q4	Local Program Heads (63 of 63)	46	33	21

The basic purpose behind the questions of this first section of the study was to probe facts and attitudes about the mission and the current and future role of public libraries in adult literacy service provision.

The section looks at what is on the minds of state and local public library professionals with respect to mission and role and also at what state literacy resource center heads think about these matters.

It also probes some of the forces that affect the extent and nature of public library involvement in adult literacy—such as funding and state and national understanding. And it seeks to draw attention to the benefits of library literacy progamming to the country in general and to public libraries in particular.

MAJOR MISSION? A CAUTIOUS YES

Clearly, in R1, **the majority in all respondent categories think the provision of literacy services should be a major mission of public libraries**.

While this is highly encouraging news, it is also significant that one-fourth of the state librarians do *not* think so, despite decades of advocacy by both library and education leaders. Moreover, about 10% of the Q1-Q3 respondents are not sure—so that on balance, about one-third of the respondees are still unconvinced about the appropriateness and importance of literacy service. Several study advisors were quite alarmed by this discovery.

Responses to questions R2-R3 are somewhat at odds with the findings of R1. Although two-thirds of the library personnel say they consider literacy a major public library mission, half indicate that development of library-based adult literacy programs are *not presently* a major mission of the state agency. This indicates that while library professionals generally embrace the provision of literacy services as a legitimate and central role for public libraries, there is a difference between what many of them say and what they do.

Beyond this, the high negative response rate to R3 by state library people was thought by one of this project's data reviewers "to be most detrimental to local library literacy programs that feel strongly about their role in their respective communities."

However, responses to question R3a suggest that **lack of funding at the state and federal level is**

by far the biggest reason for the apparent discrepancy. Lack of adequate staff resources, also cited several times as a reason, is basically a funding problem.

Furthermore, many R3a respondees feel that it is better for public libraries to support the literacy work of *others* than to have the basic responsibility themselves.

Adding a further twist to the situation, the data also suggest that some of the respondees may not really know the facts, signalling that **there is a communications problem within and among the different groups surveyed**.

For one thing, state librarians and the designated literacy professionals within their agencies differ markedly in their views about the role and present involvement of public libraries in adult literacy. For another, library agency respondees claim to be doing more to develop library literacy services than local library literacy programs think they are doing.

State literacy resource center heads think there is even less going on.

R3a. Individuals responding that library-based literacy programs are NOT a major mission of the state library agency were asked to explain why, and to indicate if and when the agency plans to adopt or expand library literacy programming. [Q1-Q4]

	Q1 (12 of 15 responded)	Q2 (10 of 16)	Q3 (17 of 22)	Q4 (15 of 21)
Lack of funding/ not enough staff resources/ budget cuts/federal cutbacks/ no state legislative attention	7	4	11	11
State library prefers to support the work of others in literacy; basic responsibility belongs to someone else; others are better equipped to provide literacy services	5	3	3	3
Literacy is just a low priority	1	1	2	2
Planning is now in process	1	1		
More interested in children's literacy	1			
State library gives LSCA grants to local libraries to address community needs they think are important	1			1
State library emphasis in on building collections		1		
Technology is the shining star			1	
Barbara Bush is no longer in office				1

R4: In general, do you think that provision of literacy services in public libraries in the future should be more important, less important, or about the same as now? [Q1-Q4]

		More Important	Less Important	The Same As Now
Q1	State Librarians (35 of 35)	60%	3%	37%
Q2	State Library Literacy Contacts (36 of 44)	81	0	19
Q3	SLRC Heads (37 of 40)	70	11	19
Q4	Local Program Heads (63 of 63)	84	0	16

Similarly, there is a sizable difference in the response of SLRC heads and local programs as to whether library literacy programs are presently a major component of their state's overall delivery system (with the latter more likely to think so).

Moreover, the high percentage of Q3 and Q4 respondees that are *not*

> If public libraries are not concerned and/or do not take a strong leadership role in literacy and/or fail to see the need for a reading populace—people who understand and appreciate the value of reading, thus of libraries—then what *is* important to a public library? Having an A1 reference collection that no one uses because the literacy level in the community is so low that most people wouldn't know about it or care? (Betty Ann Scott, FL)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

sure is another indicator of generally inadequate communications.

In R4, the vast majority of people say that they believe the provision of literacy services in public libraries should be more important in the future than now—though nearly two-thirds of state librarians would keep the level about the same. But this response, while encouraging on one level, is at odds with the heavy negative responses of R2-R3, again suggesting that many of the respondees are ambiguous about what they think. Note, however, that only 3% of the state librarians said that adult literacy services should be *reduced*. Amazingly, a relatively high 11% of the SLRC heads thought so.

THE CURRENT & FUTURE ROLES

In question R5, SLRC and local program directors speak in fairly typical ways about the role of public libraries in adult literacy. Despite the changing financial circumstances of literacy and library groups, most of them think about the library's role in terms of what already exists rather than what might be. The

R5. Given your view of literacy needs and services in the state, what new or expanded role might public libraies play to help meet the needs? Conversely, what role might be inappropriate for them because other organizations are better suited to it? [Q3, Q4]

	Q3	Q4
	# of Times Mentioned	
Coordination & collaboration (to avoid duplication of services and stretch limited funding/resources):		
Integrate/coordinate literacy work of libraries more closely with work of state departments of education, literacy program providers, and/or others at state, regional, and local levels responsible for literacy	14	12
Initiate more collaborative projects—sharing resources and expertise—with voluntary and community-based literacy groups, schools, social agencies, businesses	7	3
Participate more actively in statewide planning. Become full partners in literacy service delivery. Help build coalitions of interest. Serve as catalyst for bringing together literacy providers, potential adult learners, business and industry, and others	4	8
Work more closely with state literacy resource centers	6	
Be one of the "point" organizations for literacy in every community	1	
Provide space and other resources for literacy instruction and tutor training programs of outside literacy groups:		
Provide space/neutral sites/stigma free location for one-to-one or small group instruction/meetings/workshops	14	17
Help promote and recruit tutors and hard-to-reach students/ provide referrals, offer other outreach services	2	8
Open libraries for adult literacy instruction during weekday evenings	1	1
Collection & Materials Development		
Provide/develop reading materials/collections for adult new readers	9	17
Develop/house training and instructional materials for tutors and tutor training purposes	2	
Help log/catalog the literacy program collections developed by SLRCs, local programs, and others into regional/state library databases to which all have access	2	
Facilitate inter-library loans	1	
Sponsor bookmobiles		1
Take a more direct instruction/training role:		
Directly provide literacy instructional services, especially when no other group in the community is doing it or when patrons want them	2	6
Provide a stable base for direct training of tutors (including the training of library personnel)	4	1
Offer CAI-learning programs	1	3
Family literacy:		
Increase focus on family literacy support/programs	4	8
Serve as an entry point for adults, through their children's services	1	2

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

call is largely for more of the same.

For example, a relatively large number of respondees indicate that the main service role of libraries should be to house one-on-one or small group volunteer tutoring programs for adults at the lowest basic skills levels. Data gathered in other parts of the study suggest that very many library-based programs do indeed have these elements, possibly the majority.

But these data also point to a wide range of eclectic programs and to

> We have come a long way since the early 80s. We really seem poised to come together and coordinate. Ironical that the funding to support these efforts is about to go away.
> (Jane Heiser, OERI)
>
> It should be emphasized that collaborations are work! They are not automatic money savers, but take time to cultivate and nurture.
> (Virginia Heinrich, MN)

Table R5, cont'd

	Q3	Q4
Computers & Technology:		
Provide computers, computer services, software, and access to online services and other technology. Help develop related library and information processing skills in general, especially as these skills relate to understanding and use of technology	6	6
Help bring technology into local literacy programs (computers, distance learning, video)	1	
Provide Internet access		4
Maintain Internet home pages that profile and provide information on library literacy programs, services, issues		1
Information Services:		
Serve more as community centers of information and one-stop drop-in centers	3	6
Public Awareness & Advocacy:		
Take a stronger public relations, awareness, and advocacy role, sponsor community forums, sponsor discussions for patrons, hold readathons and workshops	2	7
ESL Services:		
Offer more ESL classes/services to immigrants, including voter registration and citizenship-testing sevices		3
Other:		
Provide leadership to local/county library literacy programs in the form of staff resources, fundraising, and curriculum/program development. Help service and planning groups cope with block grant programs	1	3
Be more supportive of local/county library literacy projects		3
Make literacy coordinator a regular library position		1
Train librarians to better work with/understand literacy providers		1
Be more sensitive to/supportive of needs of new adult readers		1
Provide testing services for potential adult literacy students to help those providing/planning instructional programs		1
Expand literacy services for the disabled		1
Roles that are appropriate or inappropriate:		
Job preparation and workplace literacy programs are inappropriate roles		3
In general, training, tutoring, and staff development should be left to literacy organizations, ABE programs, schools	1	6
Only low-level adult literacy instruction is appropriate for libraries		2
Librarians are not and should not be trained as educators	1	1
The leadership role belongs to others	1	1
Instructional services for the disabled and for people under age 18 should be a school responsibility		2
There are no inappropriate roles for libraries	1	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

highly exemplary programs—some true national models, such as the New York Public Library program—in which libraries themselves provide the staff and instruction. The point is that the respondees did not, perhaps could not, look critically or freshly at this issue, although the question clearly invited it.

> There are no stereotypical roles for either education or libraries. (Judith Rake, IL)

Significantly, however, there is prudent realization by both groups of the statewide need to avoid duplication of services. Above all else, **there is a strong call for better coordination on the part of public libraries, more collaboration, and more library involvement in overall statewide planning**—though little attention is given to what this would cost in money and service trade-offs.

A number of respondents consider libraries to be uniquely positioned in the community to help with various kinds of outreach. They feel that libraries should play a far larger role in promoting and recruiting tutors and hard-to-reach students.

The collections and development of materials should also be expanded, according to the two groups. An interesting new idea offered here is for libraries to draw the reading and training collections of SLRCs and local literacy groups into their cataloging systems, thereby expanding access to the materials.

Beyond the suggestions offered above, which are of first-order importance, respondents put forward a second tier of ideas: Some would like to see libraries take a more direct instructional/training role. There is interest in more family literacy programming. Some would like to see libraries provide much more computer and other technology support to local groups, including information services on the Internet. They want libraries to strengthen their role as community information centers and to provide awareness and advocacy leadership.

R6a. How well do you think LIBRARIANS in your state understand the potential role of libraries as education/literacy service providers? [Q1-Q4]

		Very Well	Not Well Enough	Don't Know
Q1	State librarians (35 of 35 answering)	43%	57%	0%
Q2	Library Agency Literacy Contacts (38 of 44)	42	58	0
Q3	SLRC Heads (38 of 40)	26	58	16
Q4	Local Program Heads (63 of 63)	36	56	8

R6b. How well do you think STATE & NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE & FUNDING ENTITIES understand the potential role of libraries as education/literacy service providers? [Q1-Q4]

		Very Well	Not Well Enough	Don't Know
Q1	State librarians (35 of 35 answering)	17%	77%	7%
Q2	Library Agency Literacy Contacts (38 of 44)	8	84	8
Q3	SLRC Heads (38 of 40)	3	71	26
Q4	Local Program Heads (63 of 63)	5	89	6

R6c. How well do you think LITERACY & EDUCATION PROFESSIONALS IN YOUR STATE understand the potential role of libraries as education/literacy service providers? [Q1-Q4]

		Very Well	Not Well Enough	Don't Know
Q1	State librarians (35 of 35)	46%	51%	3%
Q2	Library Agency Literacy Contacts (38 of 44)	42	58	0
Q3	SLRC Heads (38 of 40)	39	45	16
Q4	Local Program Heads (63 of 63)	40	59	1

A few see a need for more ESL services, but this suggestion came from local library programs that specialize in such services. Considering the great national need in this area, and the fact that so many literacy programs countrywide provide substantial ESL services, it is surprising that the respondees were nearly silent on this subject.

MANY WHO NEED TO UNDERSTAND DON'T

The rest of Table R5 is a potpourri of ideas and perspectives, pointing again to some ambiguity about the library's role and mission.

The responses to questions R6a-R6c may partly explain why. It is astounding that so many respondees in every category answered "not well enough."

Overall, nearly three-fifths of them think that librarians do not understand the potential role of libraries as education/literacy service providers. This suggests that they do not understand the present role very well either. Note that librarians even think this about other librarians!

State literacy and education professionals do not get very high marks either. But most troubling are the figures for state and national legislative and funding entities. On average, a full **80%of the respondents think that the very forces that affect them most through policy and funding decisions made at the state and national levels do not understand the role and potential of libraries in literacy**. The percentage of local program heads and library agency literacy personnel responding this way are a whopping 89% and 84%, respectively.

Add to all of this the very high percentage of "don't know" answers, especially on the part of SLRCs and with respect to legislators and funding groups, and there clearly is a communications and

R6d. Respondees who responded "not well enough" to one or more of the questions R6a-R6c were invited to suggest steps that might be taken to improve the understanding of librarians, state and national legislative and funding entities, and/or literacy/education professionals at the state level. [Q1-Q4]

		Responded	No Response
Q1	State librarians (3 of 29)	10%	90%
Q2	Library agency literacy contacts (7 of 34)	21	79
Q3	SLRC Heads (7 of 36)	19	81
Q4	Local Program Heads (23 of 62)	37	63

Q1 Statewide publicity and marketing to increase awareness of legislative and funding entities. (AR)

Continued emphasis on why low literacy skills reduces our overall economic competitiveness and lowers the standard of living for our children. (IN)

Nurture individual care and concern at the community level. (TN)

Q2 Statewide publicity and marketing. (AR)

Marketing. Making presentations to librarians and training librarians in how to effectively provide services and draw libraries more into partnership arrangements with other literacy groups. (IL)

Clarify what literacy is and the library's role in education. Do this by developing a descriptive statement of purpose with the most thoughtful members of the library community. Keep this statement before the public for comment and discussion until all reach common ground. (MN)

Get librarians to serve on literacy councils and to commit to community literacy groups services the library can offer. Improve communication with state and national legislative/funding entities. (MS)

It all depends on local leadership and personal understanding. (TN)

Focus on state legislative bodies. National legislative bodies do not make as much of a connection. (VT)

Q3 All three groups need to have a better sense of the educational role of libraries and, if nothing else, how to contribute effectively to the development of literacy through special collections. Also, education/literacy professionals need to know they're not the only service providers. (MN)

Sensitize and train librarians to work with non-readers. (MO)

A more concerted and systematic statewide effort to collaborate, between and among all groups. At the state legislative level, there is a tendency to gloss over adult literacy issues. (NE)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table R6d, cont'd

Every year librarians and ABE teachers come together for a joint staff development workshop (i.e. 10 librarians, 10 teachers). People involved in this program understand, and those who have had state library literacy grants are knowledgeable. (TN)

Develop master plans to exploit each other's resources to the advantage of clients. Schedule discussions to maximize resources and eliminate duplication. (UT)

Hold at least 2 statewide meetings with good representation from the three groups to develop awareness and collaboration. Encourage more partnerships involving both adult education/literacy and library people. Encourage membership on key statewide planning committees. (VA)

Q4

Legislators and educators need more exposure to the educational role of libraries, as opposed to the view that supports the library's role as the provider of entertainment or recreational reading materials. (AR)

Library directors, boards, friends, and administrators have to believe it before we can convince anyone else. These people don't tend to come to workshops, but when we can get them to attend we *do* get through to them. (FL)

Generally, legislators, funders, and literacy professionals tend to see the current role, not the potential role. One has to have worked in the literacy field or have had a consciousness-raising experience to appreciate the impact libraries can have on the provision of basic education to the community. The best way I know to raise awareness is to meet and talk to functionally illiterate adults, especially those who have been in a library-sponsored literacy program. (FL)

Librarians need to be educated about the role they can play as tutors, promoters, materials developers, and the use of their buildings as literacy sites. We need to let legislative/funding entities know at every opportunity the important role libraries are playing in the literacy field through increased lobbying. I think literacy and education professionals are fully aware already, just choosing to ignore the current and potential role of libraries. (GA)

Many people think that library literacy programs are less professional than other library departments. They are thought to be mostly voluntary in nature and to have unprofessional administration and staffing. While that is not always so, it is in many cases. Administrators of library literacy programs should have a degree and experience in adult education, reading, or education, comparable to a librarian's degree. Other professionals would then take them more seriously. (IN)

More information should be provided to all legislators. State and national departments of education should provide more information and supports. Sharing through conferences and newsletters is good, but something more innovative would be even better. I don't have any innovative ideas at the moment. (IN)

All of these groups have some individuals who understand the issue very well, but they could do more to improve the understanding of their colleagues. (MA)

Special efforts are needed to change the attitudes of local librarians who look on literacy service as an inappropriate social service role. (MA)

Territorial issues of "professional" educators vs. community-based teachers must be eliminated. (MA)

Money is just not in the library budget. It could be, with a different attitude and role (literacy) acceptance at the state and federal levels and in the library associations such as ALA and equivalent state organizations. These groups should partnership with the national literacy organizations —LVA, Laubach, NIFL—and work out a plan or formula for staffing and costs at local libraries. (MI)

Many librarians immediately understand building leadership through school visits and summer reading programs, but this understanding does not always extend to adults or immigrants. Also, funders and the general public often regard libraries as book repositories rather than organic knowledge and community centers. (MN)

A high profile statewide campaign, such as Library Card Sign Up for Adult Literacy Students, needs to be launched in order to raise awareness of librarians and the other two groups. (NC)

Libraries in the state need to enhance their public relations efforts to promote library literacy services. There could be an alliance of representatives from state library literacy programs that would serve as a forum to set policy, design programs, develop comprehensive initiatives, and

> Interesting that all categories polled did not feel that the potential role of libraries is well understood. We need to do more public relations both nationally and at the state level. In California, where libraries have been responsible for *all* the literacy promotions in the state, all providers have benefited. SLRCs can take on some of that responsibility but not in every state. Our statewide meeting with NIFL in 1995 did much to help other entities see the value and impact libraries can have. One comment heard repeatedly was that educators were surprised at the quality and professionalism of the library literacy staff! Our recent adult learner conference also opened the eyes of some educators about the work of libraries. (Carole Talan, CA)

Table R6d, cont'd

share resources and information. Legislatures need to be better informed about the range of library literacy services provided to their constituents and the impact of those services. Literacy and education professionals tend to view library literacy services as secondary to those offered by traditional educational institutions. That needs to change. (NY)

Library literacy programs need to be given greater visibility. Strong local programs are often not known about or felt statewide. Direct mailings that provide information about the programs would be helpful. (OK)

We need more of what we are already doing: library newsletter articles, workshops for librarians, provision of "starter collections." Individual libraries should be encouraged to link up with local literacy providers by someone traveling the state to facilitate this. (OR)

Librarians could receive grant money with strict guidelines to insure that adult literacy will be the focus—e.g. a family literacy project would need to include an adult instructional component as well as a children's component. Staff would need training on the needs of adults with low literacy skills. On another front, literacy professionals need to be reminded that libraries exist as learning resources. Their funding should require evidence that collaboration with libraries is being carried out. (PA)

Librarians are expected to do more and more with less and less, and they have to worry about funding for essential library services. Librarians would be more inclined to be involved if there were increased funding for library literacy. (PA)

These groups need to visit quality local programs, and talk with adults who have received help from library literacy programs about how it has changed their lives. (TX)

Librarians need to be more sensitive to the need to make their institutions more accessible and approachable to poorly skilled adults. (WI)

information problem of *tremendous* proportion. Except for about 20% of the state librarians, whose views may have been somewhat tempered by political pragmatism, the leanness of the "very well" response for legislators and funders literally jumps off the page.

BUILDING UNDERSTANDING

In R6d, the low response rate in virtually every category suggests that remarkably few of these professionals have thought very much about the poor understanding they think exists or how to overcome it. One project advisor even wondered if, when it comes right down to it, some may just not care. This verges on the incredible, considering that the well-being perhaps even the survival of library literacy programs depends *heavily* on the depth of understanding the three groups have—to say nothing of their impact on the ability of state libraries to provide support and leadership.

But the answers of those who did respond show that some people in all categories have a fairly clear grasp of contextual reality, and some good ideas. The narrative part of Table R6d gives their responses—expressed pretty much in their own words so as to give a sense of texture and nuance. (Responses that simply restated the problem or an earlier opinion are not included.) Considering that the basic role of the local programs is to provide literacy services—not leadership to develop the statewide context—their thoughtfulness and far larger response rate is quite impressive.

In the main, the ideas given in R6d have long been recognized as vital to advancing adult literacy. Building awareness and understanding through targeted and general public relations campaigns, for example. Or improving the content and flow of information to legislators, funders, educators, librarians, and other groups with a role and a stake. Or developing better lines of communications and more varied and effective collaboration. Or workshops, meetings, and publications for librarians...board members...legislators...the public...and any other groups who need to be sensitized, trained, or otherwise brought on board. Such things have been good all along. Even more would be better now, and the respondees see it.

One action urged by many of them is that more presentations to librarians take place. Such presentations would have many purposes, one being to arm librarians and library groups to more actively promote library literacy services at the state and national levels—lighting the flame for the torchbearers, so to speak.

Another cluster of ideas has to do with clarifying the role of libraries in adult literacy. "Do this," says the literacy representative of one state library agency, "by developing a descriptive statement of purpose with the most thoughtful members of the library community. Keep this statement before the public for comment and discussion until all reach common ground."

In still another grouping of ideas, **respondees feel that traditional educators do not recognize or accept the role of libraries in literacy service**. They think this turf problem should be addressed as a priority.

Master planning of one kind or another is also suggested. Ideas range from the greater involvement of librarians in planning councils and committees at the state level to the formation of new state and national alliances that would explore new program approaches and funding formulas.

"Money is just not in the library budget," says one local program head. "It could be, if there were a different attitude and role acceptance at the state and federal levels and in the library associations. These

R7. What do you personally see as the economic and social value(s) of library literacy programs? [Q1, Q2, Q4]

		Responses	No Response
Q1	State Librarians (29 of 35 responded)	83%	17%
Q2	State Library Literacy Contacts (36 of 44)	82	18
Q4	Local Program Heads (57 of 63)	90	10

A sampling of views held in common by respondees in all three categories is given below. Emphasis is on survey responses that were expressed in terms of library literacy programs, not literacy programs in general.

The mission of today's public libraries is for lifelong learning. Adult literacy programs are critical to the economic growth and stability of America. The statistics alone are overwhelming that people who cannot read cannot contribute to the economic and social infrastructure. Literacy will not solve every problem but its affect will be felt by less dollars spent on corrections and welfare and more participation in educational and political programs. (Q1, AL)

An educated, motivated workforce will mean economic strength and viability to our state and community. The public library is the best positioned public agency to coordinate and lead these programs. (Q1, HI)

Library literacy programs can have significant economic and social value. In much the same way as other public library programs/services, library literacy programs influence and affect local communities. In a selfish way, library literacy programs offer public libraries the opportunity to "grow" their own users. (Q1, IA)

Library literacy programs provide a community-centered and individualized method of assisting adults to acquire essential reading skills. Libraries offer a perfect environment for the new reader or literacy student to begin using their newly acquired skills. This training brings the student into contact with government in a positive way, and facilitates the transition to becoming an independent learner and self-supporting member of the community. (Q1, MI)

The social value would be in the area of including another segment of the population in the planning of Library Programs. The segment being the "new reader." In the area of economics the library would serve more patrons and circulation would increase. In budget justifications members can equal dollars. A more literate population also means more and/or better jobs that in turn equal more revenue for local businesses and a larger tax base. (Q1, SD)

Economics—resource materials readily available, flexible hours of operation. Social—library setting is generally nonthreatening to nonreaders enrolled in literacy classes. Some new readers become lifelong users and break the cycle of intergenerational illiteracy. (Q2, AR)

Library literacy programs provide a sense of stability and safety in many communities whose residents are disproportionately represented in the lower literacy levels as documented by both the [national adult literacy] and Illinois surveys. Libraries also provide unlimited sources of information to meet any student's needs. Library staff also are a resource to assist those adults and families lacking the skills to locate information for themselves. As tax-supported entities, public libraries provide most of these services at no charge to clients. Money for such services is often an issue with literacy patrons. (Q2, IL)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table R7, cont'd

A literate citizenry is an informed citizenry; an informed citizenry is a participative citizenry. Libraries are the most available and approachable institution for *all* learners in lifelong pursuit of jobs, education, and participation in democracy. (Q2, LA)

Library literacy programs highlight a key role of the library as a source for lifelong learning. They reach out to a population which has a right to library services and programs which are traditionally under-represented in the community. (Q2, MA)

Library literacy programs can help advance the literacy level of the community, which, in the long term, advances the literacy level of the state. Higher literacy can lead to economic development, higher incomes, and greater self-pride. These factors can enhance the quality of life for new readers and the library community as a whole. (Q2, MO)

Libraries are a permanent institution in a student's community. Services are available at no cost before, during, and after a student's enrollment in a formal education program either through the library or elsewhere. A library can be used for intergenerational learning. It provides community, job, and entrepreneurship information. (Q2, NY)

To create lifelong learners, thinkers, and seekers of information for self-enlightenment. To create families that instill a lifetime of love of reading for pleasure and knowledge. To create communities that encourage learning and self-growth. (Q2, VT)

Unless we have a literate population, forget democracy. Libraries are one of the foundations of democracy. (Q2, WI)

Library literacy programs provide meaningful volunteer opportunities for individuals who want to serve their community by tutoring other adults. The programs enable adult learners to make significant life changes based on educational gains and increased self-esteem. These changes include finding a job, changing jobs to find a better one, discounting dependence on welfare, becoming a U.S. citizen, and becoming an active participant in the democratic process by voting. (Q4, Literacy Program, Napa City County Library, CA)

Socially, libraries are comfortable places to learn, and librarians are seldom judgmental. Economically, with a corps of volunteers, 200-300 adults per year can be taught during the course of the year...good value for having only two library personnel in our department. (Q4, Project LEAD, Miami-Dade Public Library System, FL)

Promotion of employability and economic self-sufficiency...citizen participation in government and community life...crime prevention...family literacy, effective parenting...enhanced quality of life (personal fulfillment, self-confidence, self-sufficiency)...improved health and safety...lifelong learners who know how to utilize the wealth of resources and services of the library. (Q4, DeKalb County Public Library, GA)

Library literacy programs reach the most isolated adult nonreaders who have few, if any, other hopes except the literacy program. For ESL students and families, the programs provide cultural education as well as literacy skills. Literacy programs focus on life skills, parenting, job hunting, etc. and provide assistance to people with no other assistance available. (Q4, Literacy Program, Thomas Crane Public Library, MA)

Social values—libraries are easily accessible by the public and easily located. Age of patron or formal education is not a barrier. There is a degree of anonymity for patrons, making it less embarrassing for adults to seek help. Economic—libraries can house literacy programs at zero or low-cost overhead. Library staff can handle inquiries as part of their regular routine. (Q4, MARC Literacy Program, Greenville Public Library, MI)

Library literacy programs often serve adults who are at the most beginning levels in their reading and writing development, and who would otherwise not be eligible to participate in traditional reading and writing programs that serve populations reading above 4.0 [grade equivalency level]. The literacy program [here] serves people in communities identified as being most in need based upon current economic and educational profiles. In addition, libraries are often volunteer programs enabling community residents to give something positive back to their neighborhoods. (Q4, Centers for Reading and Writing, New York Public Library, NYC)

As adults improve their reading, writing, and math skills, they earn higher wages, which results in more taxes to support libraries. Also adults who are tutored in libraries or who are shown how to use library services become enthusiastic supporters. Another observed benefit is the modification of negative attitudes toward other people. (Q4, LEARN Project, Eugene Public Library, OR)

Since I live in a state with high illiteracy rates and we also have inadequate schools, high rates of traffic accidents (you don't have to be able to read to get a license here), signs in the grocery store that are virtually illegible, rising rates of AIDS, and a low standard of living, I think that illiteracy contributes greatly to a fearful, conservative, and often ignorant populace. Library literacy programs that promote literacy work to reduce all of that, *and* to give people the idea that information to help solve problems is available to *everybody!* (Q4, Literacy Program, Greenville County Library, SC)

Social values abound. It is an extension of the reading spectrum and the democratic principles which libraries hold dear. It gives the library a fuller and altruistic component to its mission. (Q4, Literacy Programs/Lifelong Learning, Seattle Public Library, WA) groups should partnership with the national literacy organizations—LVA, Laubach, NIFL—and work out a plan or formula for staffing and costs at local libraries."

"There could be an alliance of representatives from state library literacy programs that would serve as a forum to set policy, design programs, develop comprehensive initiatives, and share resources and information," says another program head.

GREAT ECONOMIC & SOCIAL VALUE

Question R7 shifts the debate to a quite different track. The very high response rate here points to a broad awareness of adult functional illiteracy as a problem centrally important to the nation. The link between adult basic skills proficiency (which enables adults to function well in skill-dependent tasks) and the economic and social fabric of the country is recognized by the majority in every group.

However, most of the answers in R7 were given in terms of literacy programs generally, not *library* literacy programs in particular. (Note: Only a sampling of the most responsive returns are included in the table.) This squares with the call so many respondees made earlier for activities to better define the role of public libraries.

But more than that, it underscores a need to better and more widely *articulate* that role, in ways that make it distinctive and definably different—and that also make it much more natural and immediate in the thinking of librarians and other library literacy personnel.

R8. What benefits do libraries themselves get from providing library literacy programs (e.g. increased patronage, higher circulation figures, greater community visibility/support, cultivation of adult readers as new clientele)? [Q1, Q2]

		Responses	No Response
Q1	State Librarians (31 of 35)	89%	11%
Q2	State Library Literacy Contacts (37 of 44)	84	16

	# Times Mentioned By	
	Q1	Q2
Better community visibility and support, and a higher public sense of relevance	24	30
Cultivation of adult readers as new users/ greater library use	23	20
Increased patronage, customers, advocates	17	19
Higher circulation figures	16	15
More family literacy use and programming	3	3
Collaboration with community groups, which can grow into other program connections and partnerships	5	5
A sense of bettering the overall community, setting an example of success, better public relations for the library, building good will in the community	5	3
Recognition as the lifelong learning institution in the community/visibility as an education agency/ recognition as an integral member of the education community		4
The opportunity to show that libraries today are more than books, a new and wider identification as involved and active in the community		2
A way to demonstrate why the public should invest in libraries	1	
A stronger self-assessment of the library role	1	
Political visibility	1	
A more informed and engaged citizenry	1	1
Through support of workforce literacy, contributing to the local, state, and national economy	1	

> A case can be made for library literacy programs as the irreducible backbone of the literacy movement during the hard times when literacy and government support for it falls from the public spotlight. Why cede that role to the state education folks? Claim that turf.
>
> (Forrest Chisman, Southport Institute for Policy Analysis)

Interestingly enough, the responses that *were* given in relation to library literacy programs are substantial and full of insight and conviction. Taken together they make a poignant and compelling case for library literacy programs—and again the responses from local program heads are remarkably sophisticated.

In the aggregate, they reflect a profound understanding of the public library as a respected, trusted, and permanent institution firmly anchored in the community, a bulwark of democracy and civilized society closely tied to the needs, circumstances, and interests of the public it serves.

They recognize the organic connection between a library's commitment and leadership in providing adult literacy services, its ability to attract community interest and funds, and the economic vitality of the community in terms of jobs and an improved tax base.

They see the public library as a barrier-free, non-threatening haven where adults in need of upgraded skills can go for help (whether given by an outside tutoring group or directly by the library) and where they can count on being treated with respect.

Moreover, the respondees stress that **library literacy programs are uniquely able to reach the most isolated and poorly-skilled adults and to serve these people at a relatively low cost, or where the adult learner is concerned at no cost.**

And, not least, library literacy programs are seen as valuable public service opportunities for people who want to volunteer and *give back* to their communities.

Any organized effort to mold a guiding definition for the role of public libraries in adult literacy—one that the field as a whole could rally behind and use to present a united front—would be off to a running start if it took to heart the ideas in R7.

Benefits To Public Libraries Themselves

In question R8, the value issue was explored from a different angle. Library personnel (Q1 and Q2 groups) were asked about the specific benefits *libraries* get from providing library literacy programs—and some examples were given to help direct the thinking.

The question elicited an even larger response than R7, suggesting that whatever ambiguities may exist about the nature of their role in literacy, **librarians and library agency literacy professionals recognize that their institutions gain in many ways from providing literacy services.**

Not surprisingly, the "starter" examples given in the question are seen as far and away the most important benefits, with greater community support, cultivation of new adult readers, increased patronage, and higher circulation figures mentioned in that rank order.

But other benefits came repeatedly to mind as well—an increase in the use of libraries by families, for instance, along with more interest in family literacy programming.

Opportunity in collaboration with community groups, some say, because that can grow into links and partnership projects with other groups—a kind of building-the-bridges benefit.

And personal and professional satisfaction—sometimes its own reward—which comes from a sense of having bettered the community. Moreover, good deeds feel good and they engender good will.

2: THE USE & LIMITS OF TECHNOLOGY

There is a strong push in Washington and in many state legislatures for greater use of technology (i.e. computers, television, and other media) throughout education.

T1. Do you think it is important for library literacy programs in your state (adult literacy programs generally in the case of SLRCs) to adopt or make heavier use of COMPUTERS? [Q1-Q4]

		Yes	No	Not Sure
Q1	State Librarians (35 of 35 answered)	85%	3%	11%
Q2	Library Agency Literacy Contacts (38 of 44)	79	8	13
Q3	SLRC Heads (40 of 40)	98	2	0
Q4	Local Program Heads (63 of 63)	73	18	9

T2. Would (your state's public libraries for Q1-Q2, adult literacy programs generally for Q3, or "you" for Q4) benefit from adopting or making heavier use of DISTANCE LEARNING TECHNOLOGY (television and related video technology) for adult literacy purposes? ([Q1-Q4]

		Yes	No	Not Sure
Q1	State Librarians (35 of 35)	63%	17%	20%
Q2	Library Agency Literacy Contacts (35 of 44)	60	14	26
Q3	SLRC Heads (39 of 40)	90	8	2
Q4	Local Program Heads (63 of 63)	44	21	35

Research and long experience have shown that computers and distance learning technology, wisely implemented, can increase educational outreach, access, instructional effectiveness, independent learning, and economies in cost. Thus, groups Q1-Q4 were asked what they thought about the role and use of these tools in their adult literacy programs.

Moreover, explosive advances in the new communications technology are propelling library professionals, like everyone else, down the "information highway" with such speed that it would be remiss for this reason alone not to seek the respondents' perceptions about technology.

They were reminded in a preface to the questions that Washington and many state legislatures are currently advocating greater use of technology throughout education.

It should be noted that close to 100% of all study participants chose to answer questions T1 and T2, which in itself shows a very strong interest in technology. Indeed, few other questions in the survey drew such a heavy response across the board.

The figures in the above table reveal an extraordinary degree of support for greater use of both computers *and* distance learning technology.

TECHNOLOGY EMBRACED... BUT WITH CAUTION

It is surprising that the library agency personnel, especially the librarians themselves, so heavily favor *both*—more than four-fifths favor more computer use and some two-thirds say they would like to see more distance learning use.

Equally striking, though for somewhat different reasons, are the responses of groups Q3 and Q4.

State literacy resource center heads, with their positive responses of 98% and 90% respectively, appear to understand the need for computer technology best and to most appreciate the possibilities of distance learning.

And, local programs—those who actually *provide* library literacy services—have the heaviest *negative* response.

While local groups are three times more likely to favor more use of computers than not to, they are not as wildly enthusiastic as the other groups, and only 44% of them think that distance learning technology has potential.

What does their lower enthusiasm mean, especially where distance learning is concerned? The responses themselves give some strong clues.

Data gathered in question T3 and throughout this study suggest that, in general, local library literacy programs are struggling financially to preserve their core instructional services, even in some cases just to survive. Thus, they may appreciate better than anyone else that *any* new technology (and the training and staff that such would require) is a luxury they cannot afford right now.

In addition, some of the programs—especially those emhasizing one-on-one or small-group tutoring or that celebrate the importance of caring, personal contact—may not be all that convinced that more computers, let alone television and other technology, can help them do their jobs better.

Moreover, the heavy "not sure" response in T2 is very telling. More than

T3. If you think more use of computers or of distance learning technologies is important (to library literacy programs in Q1-Q2, to adult literacy programs generally in Q3, to "you" in Q4), what plans do you have for achieving this? [Q1-Q4]

		Responses	No Response
Q1	State Librarians (23 responses of 30 possible)	77%	23%
Q2	Library Agency Literacy Contacts (25 of 35)	71	29
Q3	SLRC Heads (38 of 41)	93	7
Q4	Local Programs (47 of 51)	92	8

[Note: A few non-respondees considered the question "not applicable."]

Q1 & Q2 - Public Library Plans Indicated	Q1	Q2
Establish/strengthen computer-assisted instruction centers and labs. (DC, HI)	2	
Use electronic network resources to provide literacy resources. (DE)	1	
Our libraries are already equipped but need training, which is and can best be provided by our SLRC. (IL)	1	
Over 100 public libraries in this state are downlink sites for distance education and we are incorporating technology with a literacy mission. (WV)	1	
Our state library is encouraging librarians around the state to install distance learning meeting rooms. (IA)	1	
Continued dissemination of GED on TV in public libraries throughout the state. (MN)	1	
Iowa libraries have spent millions to buy computers. The State Library has spent $2.5 million to bring online information to libraries. Some 90 public libraries are on the statewide distance education network. (IA)	1	
The Internet and WWW are the most promising technologies now (video is too expensive) and we are watching the developments. (OR)	1	
Take part in state master planning for technology. (TX)	1	
Work with libraries and other groups to support development of computer literacy. (RI)	1	
If more funding comes from bond issues presently in the state legislature, we hope to get more technology into libraries. (ME)	1	
Encourage local and regional librarians to include computers in their grant applications. (WI)	1	
Encourage library use of information resources on the Internet. (IA)	1	
The state library provides/allows literacy program funding for purchase/use of technology. (KS, CA)	1	1
Statewide Internet access via public libraries is being developed now in a demonstration project with literacy students. (ND)	1	1
The SLRC and other key literacy and ABE groups in the state will keep using the Rural Distance Communications Network to provide training and hold board meetings. (SD)	1	1
Keep working with our SLRC to educate library personnel about available software. (OH)	1	1

Table T3, cont'd	Q1	Q2
State librarian is on statewide board for distance learning. (FL)	1	1
Planning in process now for statewide library telecommunications network that will be able to link to academic and government groups. (MS)	1	1
If more federal funding is available (LSCA or other) make technology for libraries a priority—then offer teleconferencing services to literacy programs. (AR)	1	1
Work with technical college system to explore new technologies, including distance learning. (WI, WA)	1	1
Distance-learning-technology is particularly appropriate for rurally isolated areas of the state. We are providing funding for public libraries to connect to the Internet, encouraging systems to collaborate with community agencies and organizations to share catalogs and resources online, and providing funds for community information referral programs in the libraries. (TX)		1
Use of distance learning models that can provide training, as in Pennsylvania. Work to provide more libraries with Internet access (many of our local library literacy programs are already profiled on a special Internet site). (MA)		1
The State Library will produce more interactive video conferences on literacy, train more educators and librarians how to work with computer and distance learning formats, increase our video holdings in literacy with local programs given permission to duplicate them, and encourage more libraries to purchase technology or distance learning downlinks. (IL)		1
The Department of Libraries is placing at least one computer in each pubic library in our state. The Literacy Office has established an electronic bulletin board for literacy. The BB lists local, state, and national training, grant and employment opportunities, legislative alerts, and literacy "swap" lists. (OK)		1
A LSCA Title VI grant set up six adult learning work stations in public libraries for the purpose of demonstrating their effectiveness. Sharing the results of this demonstration should assist in increasing the use of the technology. The Oregon Information Highway Project is attempting to increase Internet connectivity in public libraries. If adult learning programs can be effectively transmitted, adult new readers could certainly use them once the libraries are connected to the Internet. Libraries also need to refer students more to programs broadcast over the state's distance learning system as administered through ABE programs in community colleges. (OR)		1
Participation in community networks via satellite and connection to the Internet. (IN)		1
We just started working with our library school to initiate courses in local libraries for literacy students. (CT)		1
Encourage each library to plan for education to be available via alternate routes. (TN)		1
Look continuously for grant/funding opportunities for hardware and software and disseminate the information. (LA)		1
Hold up technology as a tool, work to ensure equitable access, and encourage library services to make technology available to their publics. (MN)		1
Other (e.g. none, someone else's concern, no funds just encouragement, we're looking for resources).	3	5

one-third (35%) of the local groups say that they don't know enough about the matter to make a judgment. On this point, the high "not sure" response of the library personnel with respect to distance learning is also significant. Once again, inadequate communications and limited understanding appear to be problems.

Table T3 responses also raise questions about the *nature* of the generally high interest in technology. Things may not mean exactly what they seem to.

For instance, many of the T3 respondents, especially in groups Q1 and Q2, use a highly computer-oriented definition of "distance learning," rather than the one set up in question T2.

In education circles, *television, related video technology, and other media* usually refers to the use of broadcast and recording media for instruction and tutor/teacher training—to extend outreach...or provide independent learning opportunties...or, where video is concerned, to enable greater customization and portability of education. Yet in the minds of most of the respondents, distance learning is less equated with educational technology in the old sense than with electronic (computer!) networking for information sharing and with the newest communications paths to information—the Internet and World Wide Web.

This definition problem blurs somewhat the clarity of the T1-T2 response. What seems at first to be an astounding breakthrough in the understanding and acceptance of the broadcast media for educational purposes is not necessarily the case at all despite the vast unrealized potential of these media.

Moreover, it should be noted that the Internet and World Wide Web venues, captivating as they are, are probably more useful to program staff and tutors than to low-skilled adult students. It is hard to imagine that people with very poor reading and writing skills would be able to make much use of this technology even if they had physical access to it and even if they could

Table T3, cont'd

Q3 - SLRC Plans (adult literacy programs generally)	
AL	Implementation of performance, measurement, reporting, and improvement systems.
AK	We're doing it.
AZ	NIFL grant to Western Region for electronic networking among SLRCs and national entities.
CA	Working closely with the Distance Learning Project of the State Department of Education.
CO	Working on a networking/communication system.
CT	Developing more training for literacy providers in the use of new technology. Developing a software/media library for previewing and circulation. Home Page on the Internet.
HI	The Hawaii SLRC belongs to a regional hub.
IA	Our Center will have a server site on the Internet in the Winter/Spring of 1996. We will position computers/modems at each community college, ABE site, and public library.
IL	We have trained 19 providers statewide in a train-the-trainer program using the America Online and Internet five-day training program of the National Center for Adult Literacy. We are also encouraging programs to use state and federal grant dollars for modems and communication packages as well as instructional software for students. We contracted with the Illinois Center of Excellence for Technology Development at Waubonsee Community College to do regional workshops on technology planning, integrating technology in instruction, and hypermedia. We have been participants in video conferences produced by the Illinois State Library and Western Illinois University.
IN	Network through computers. Have system operators responsible for monitoring, cultivating dialogue on certain topics. Research Center to coordinate.
KS	The public television station in Kansas City has provided the opportunity to electronically link all adult education facilities. Funds are available to add all library literacy programs to that network, but they are not approved for that use.
KY	Literacy providers and therefore students do not have ready access to technology hardware and courseware. Steps have been taken to ensure that each literacy provider has computerized record-keeping capability. Funds are not available to the adult education network to keep adult students technologically literate.
LA	We were the first state to link the JSEP program to incarcerated youth and adults. Recidivism has dropped dramatically. LSU has initiated six family literacy sites—in remote areas—via full-motion interactive video over telephone lines.
MD	This year's program includes merging with the local area network to publicize the Center's materials and activities.
MI	We conduct professional development programs via two-way interactive television. We also conduct business meetings, provide training on two-way, and have established a computer bulletin board.
MN	We're looking at developing on a state level an information network using the World Wide Web, linking information about the state-level organizations. We are planning to cultivate a network of groups around the state that can coordinate distance learning opportunities in their areas. We also want to use the Internet as a delivery mechanism.
MO	We are purchasing videos and software to loan. We're planning to develop professional development classes and workshops for distance learning. We are going to have a WWW Home Page.
MS	We are developing a plan to provide training to practitioners and other interagency personnel, also to link resources.

afford the online service charges.

Along these same lines, library personnel and SLRC heads almost universally favor the greater use of computers, and they overwhelmingly favor more distance learning technology. But fewer than half of the state library people in T3 make any reference at all to library *literacy* programs. They think more generally in terms of advancing their information service role. That goal is certainly vital to their mission and their publics as an immediate and first priority. But that was not the question posed.

A different kind of issue surfaces in the SLRC response to question T3. This group doesn't refer very often to library literacy programs either. But they can't be faulted for this when they were asked about adult literacy programs in general. What is striking is that their thinking here jibes with their responses to questions asked elsewhere in the survey about the role and place of public libraries in statewide service delivery. Only a handful of the strongest SLRCs, then and now,

Table T3, cont'd

MT None currently, but a long-range, strategic process is "in the works."

NC Contract for NCAL/PBS teleconferences. Include distance learning in our family literacy plans. Participate in an Internet access project as part of a NIFL technology grant for regional hubs. Software evaluation and "vendor fair" activities are in the planning stages in cooperation with the NCLA Literacy committee.

ND No concrete plans at this time.

NE The SLRC is preparing to conduct a statewide survey of adult literacy providers (ABE/GED, ESL, volunteer literacy groups, community-based, library, etc.) to assess existing computer use and/or access and begin to identify what is needed across the state to encourage greater use of technology. We hope to establish a statewide listserv available to all groups, learners, businesses, agencies. We are also beginning some ABE/GED staff development efforts using distance education technologies. There will be additional training provided across the state beginning in the summer of 1996, to help familiarize people with the use of computers in an instructional/learning capacity.

NJ Raising awareness of the positive impact that appropriately used instructional technology has. Demonstration workshops and library lending of SLRC-owned software and videotapes. Model practices workshops using local program staff currently involved with the use of technology.

NM We have initiated a number of privately funded projects to place computers and software with local literacy programs. We will continue to do this.

NY None at this time because the SLRC will cease to exist after 12/31/95.

OH Our SLRC maintains a gopher and WWW server for adult education resources. We provide training on the Internet for teachers, and maintain a listserv for Ohio adult literacy educators. We are the Regional Technology Hub for the eleven other Midwest SLRCs (NIFL grant). We will be helping them develop WWW pages, add state-specific information to the server, and work with local programs to use the resources on the Internet.

OK More funding for equipment and training.

PA Provide resources/training in the administrative/instructional use of technology. Initially a plan was developed to create a Center for the use of distance learning technologies. However, with the recision of funding, full implementation of the "Tech Center" will be placed on hold.

SC We provide much CAI training. We also go out with a coach to local business and industry sites. A JTPA grant pays for the driver.

SD The technology is in place and in use for online access to and borrowing of materials. The sharing of resources is a must in this time of shrinking state and federal budgets.

TN Limited staff development has been offered via satellite downlink. At present, there are no plans (or funds) to develop distance learning opportunities for literacy programs.

UT We have secured the latest technology and media (CD-ROMs, Internet connections, etc.) and we demonstrate and train adult literacy providers throughout the state in the application of these technologies. We have launched distance learning instructional programs via public television.

VT LINCs grant—NIFL funding. Support from the Department of Education. Promotion of professional development opportunities, including state conferences.

VA Our state is invested heavily in automating the SLRC and for the SLRC to establish an electronic information/communications system with local and state programs and national groups. Technology implementation and training in use of said technology is a major goal for our SLRC.

WA Continue to provide training in the use of technology. Continue to publish technology users' guides annually. Explore use of the Internet as a practitioner-inquiry group medium.

include libraries in their thinking or, for that matter, approach delivery system issues in a truly systemic way.

It is not that the qualifier caveats just touched on diminish the very high level of interest these groups have in technology, but they do caution against an overly optimistic interpretation of the findings. In any case, the basic purpose of question T3 was to determine whether those favoring more use of technology have plans for achieving it, and if so what they might be planning to do.

TECHNOLOGY PLANNING: READY & WILLING, BUT ABLE?

In terms of quantity alone, the responses indicate that a lot is already going on across the country at both state and local levels. It can't be boiled down to a few clear patterns because of the immense variety from place to place. For that reason, the entire table is presented here. Neither is it possible, on the basis of the data gathered, to judge the quality or depth of the activities or to judge if an

Table T3, cont'd

WV	We currently have a 5-year plan underway. If funding exists it will be continued. We are sequentially and geographically providing training and equipment to literacy providers across the state.
WI	The SLRC is actively involved in bringing together technology suppliers and instructors to promote planning and professional development.
WY	No funds, only encouragement.

Q4 - Local Program Plans (self-help)

AR	Computers are today—and so are our students! Any computer-related services offered to volunteers (training, in-service, instruction) would be realistic in today's technology. It represents reading for living/life skills, payoff of economic and social promotions for individuals. But space is limited. *(Literacy Council of Hot Spring County)*
AR	We are looking at ways to make the computer more available to ESL students. *(Reading Together, Arkansas River Valley Libraries for Literacy)*
CA	Finding funds to support the purchase of computers. *(Napa County Library Literacy Program)*
CA	We have been part of a computer-aided literacy project for the past 3 years (Santa Clara County Library is the fiscal agent). We plan to continue participating as long as it is funded. *(Partners in Reading, San Jose Public Library)*
CA	We use computers with our students. We would like for 90% of students to be tied into a computer group in addition to their tutoring. We are scheduling more classes. *(Commerce Public Library Adult Literacy Program)*
CA	Currently working with local community college to use download training/in-service sessions for tutors. Also working with local network expert to network all office computers and computer in off-site office for better use of management software. *(LVA-Marin County, San Rafael Public Library)*
CO	None at present. Our library is very limited in space available. We need sites for computers if we decide to expand. *(Literacy Program, Mesa County Public Library District)*
CT	We have three computers loaded with educational software for learners and a TV/VCR. *(LVA-Greater Waterbury, Silas Bronson Library)*
DE	Purchase new, updated equipment and software. *(LVA-Wilmington Library)*
FL	None—support for program is dwindling. We're focused now on simply maintaining what we have. *(Hillsborough Literacy Council, Tampa-Hillsborough County Library System)*
FL	We have educational computer programs in our literacy learning center from pre-K up on reading, math, geography, etc. Videos to teach reading at home or train tutors. *(Panhandle Library Literacy Consortium, Jefferson County Public Library)*
FL	It is going to be a focus of fundraising in the next two years. *(Each One-Teach One, Broward County Public Library)*
FL	Our most recent purchases have included CD-ROMs and sound. We use videotapes and would like to be able to purchase more videos. We have made no plans for distance learning but would like to collaborate with other local providers to begin to explore ways to offer our students this option. *(Center for Adult Learning, Jacksonville Public Libraries)*
GA	We are in the process of trying to add more computers to our Learning Center as well as initiate them in our outreach facilities/locations. We have extended the satellite dish capabilities to our Learning Center to facilitate distance learning. Extended network to Learning Center to facilitate computer-based education. *(Learning Center, Athens-Clarke County Public Library)*

Table T3, cont'd

GA We use both and currently have a 24-hour, 7-day a week television cable channel devoted to literacy. *(Literacy Program, Sara Hightower Regional Library)*

GA To seek grant funds for additional computer learning labs and a mobile computer learning lab. When the library becomes connected to the Internet, we'd like to provide special opportunities for adult learners to participate in listservs such as LEARNER. To develop a coalition of county agencies to address literacy needs of their employees which could be met by using a mobile computer lab and/or the library distance learning site. *(Literacy Program of DeKalb County Public Library)*

IL Currently involved in statewide pilot project for technology. Wrote a technology plan for library literacy. *(Libraries for Literacy in Lake County)*

IN We have already requested certain hardware and software as "wish lists," and include hardware purchases among those items we could use from local benefactors. Our use of technology would primarily aid us in work throughout, and not so much in our educational objectives. *(Literacy Program, Knox County Public Library)*

KS We are seeking computers, software and cash donations from our business community. *(Literacy Program, Johnson County Library)*

MA We are using a computer grant this year to fully develop the use of our 9 computers with learners. We'll be using a modem and gaining access to Internet. *(Read Write/Now, Springfield City Library-Mason Sq. Branch)*

MA Getting a dedicated phone line/modem. Funds to buy more software. *(Center for New Americans, Jones Library)*

MA With each proposal we develop, we include resources for new technology. Currently there are no other means available to acquire technology for Lawrence. Four out of the last five years, due to inadequate local funding, we have had to raise money to buy books! *(Newcomer Family Literacy Project, The Lawrence Public Library)*

MA We plan to train tutors more effectively and efficiently in using computers that are available for use in the library. *(Literacy Program, Thomas Crane Public Library)*

MI We struggle to exist now. People in our community don't expect their taxes to be used for supporting administration of literacy programs. They want their donations to go for direct benefit of the student being served—educational materials and volunteer tutor training. Of course, this doesn't happen without administrative costs. *(MARC Literacy Program, Greenville Public Library)*

MN We are developing a program so that the library will have two additional CD-ROM work stations and the Hubbs Center at two computers with direct access to the library catalog (which includes a magazine index and catalogs for other metropolitan public libraries). Within the next two years all the libraries in the city will offer Internet access. At present it is a pilot at the Hamline Branch. *(Linking Libraries & Literacy for Lifelong Learning, Lexington Branch Library, St. Paul)*

MN We have received a grant for adopting computing for differently abled. We will establish an open computing lab in 1997. *(Franklin Learning Center, Franklin Community of Library, Minneapolis Public Library)*

NC Applying for grants for software, hardware, distance learning. *(Community of Readers, Glenwood Library, Greensboro)*

NJ Since the literacy program personnel is minimal, and the influx of learners is high, we do not have time to keep the records on computer anymore. *(Basic Skills for Reading and ESL, Elizabeth Public Library)*

NJ It's not carried out in a vacuum. We are in the process of purchasing more software both kids and adults can use. TV and radio are used by our learners to learn more about their communities via discussion-led group activities. *(Literacy for Non-English Speakers, Paterson Free Public Library)*

NM Working with local university and ABE classes. *(LVA-Socorro County, Socorro Public Library)*

NY Seeking out funding for two full-time technology persons and more hardware and software. *(Literacy Program, Brooklyn Public Library)*

activity in one state has as much weight as that same activity in another state.

Yet, it is significant to find in Table T3 that, with a few exceptions, the plans described by librarians and library agency literacy professionals tend to be somewhat static. They have the feel of being very tentative...conditioned on the continued availability of already inadequate funding...modest in scope and vision...and exploratory in nature.

The talk is largely in terms of *encouraging* others to do something... *exploring* ideas with other groups...*looking for* resources and funding... *getting ready to* plan... *watching* the developments...or continuing to do what is already being done, e.g. *allowing* the use of funds for technology purchases by local library literacy programs.

Still, several of the Q1 and Q2 responses are quite proactive and substantial.

For example, the state librarian of Iowa says that "the State Library has spent $2.5 million to bring online information to libraries. Some 90 public libraries are on the statewide distance education network."

In Oregon, "a LSCA Title VI grant set up six adult learning work stations in public libraries for the purpose of demonstrating their effectiveness. Sharing the results of this demonstration should assist in increasing the use of the technology. The Oregon Information Highway Project is attempting to increase Internet connectivity in public libraries....Libraries also need to refer students more to programs broadcast over the state's distance learning system as administered through ABE programs in community colleges."

In Illinois, "the State Library will produce more interactive video conferences on literacy, train more educators and librarians how to work with computer and distance learning formats, and increase [its] video holdings in literacy (with local programs given permission to duplicate them)."

The Library Commission spokeswoman in Massachusetts advocates "use of distance learning models that can

Table T3, cont'd

NY	In the Fall of 1994, the Centers brought in the former director of the Technology Center at NCAL, to evaluate the current status of technology in the program and to prepare a plan that would include long and short term goals. The following activities have been initiated as a result of the report: the purchase of one multi-media computer for each Center, the development of a task group to review and recommend multimedia software, the Bloomingdale and Fordham Centers have gone online as a result of a grant from the NYC Professional Development Consortium, and extending computer hours at Centers to increase student access. In addition we plan to work toward achieving the following goals: provide more comprehensive and continuous training for professionals and volunteers, implement a planned computer literacy curriculum for students, continue to upgrade computers at CRW sites, continue to develop Central Software Database, and begin to develop online assessment techniques. *(Centers for Reading & Writing, New York Public Library)*
OK	I have the technology and software now; am in the process of developing such a program. (Star-Hartley Invest Learning) *(Great Plains Literacy Council, Southern Prairie Library System)*
OK	We just completed a public fundraiser to raise funds to purchase software for the public computers in the library. *(Moore Literacy Council, Cleveland County Library)*
OK	None at this point; we have neither the funding nor the physical space to implement the use of computers in the literacy program. *(Literacy Council of LeFlore County, Buckley Public Library)*
OR	We need to build our new library first, but are researching software and investigating computer space possibilities in this one. *(LEARN Project, Eugene Public Library)*
PA	(1) We have received a LSCA Title VI Library Literacy Programs grant for 1995-96. With LSCA funds, we will research adult literacy resources on the Internet, provide Internet training for 24 adult learners and their instructors, and publish the 5th edition of the RDP Bibliography on the Internet. Access will continue beyond the project through the RDP Internet Center. (2) At least four times a year, our staff members provide workshops for tutors and teachers. New and significant books are highlighted, but an increasing emphasis is being placed on computer software suitable for adult learners. These workshops will be expanded to a second location where the computers acquired through the Internet project will be used. *(Reader Development Program, Free Library of Philadelphia)*
PA	We would like to train tutors to use computers in our tutor training workshop. We also would like to compile a list of available computer resources (hardware and software) available at local libraries. If we had additional funding, we could purchase software. *(Bradford-Wyoming County Literacy Program, Bradford County Library)*
RI	For management applications, a new computer and updated software will produce more professional PR materials, i.e. brochures, flyers, newsletters, reports, letters. An approved grant will provide for acquisition of such technology. *(LVA-Kent County, Coventry Public Library)*
SC	The Library will acquire instructional audio-video materials and equipment, three computers, literacy software, one set of read-along classics, and necessary books to complete a core print literacy collection. Curriculum is shifting to more use of computers, videos, and non-print materials. Video and audio tapes and equipment are not inexpensive, and are cumbersome to transport. *(Literacy Program, Greenville County Library)*
TX	During March of 1996, we will be opening a new Literacy Center to include a 20-station computer learning lab. *(Literacy Center, El Paso Public Library)*
TX	None at this time. *(Andrews Adult Literacy Program of Andrews Public Library)*
UT	Yes on DLT for staff training purposes. We have applied for a grant that would enable us to purchase educational hardware and software, and training personnel. We currently offer introductory computer instruction in a classroom setting. *(Bridgerland Literacy, Logan Library)*
VA	Provide for student use computer software or basic literacy and pre-GED. (Literacy Program, Newport News Public Library)
WA	We plan to provide access to ABE/ESL/GED software on a walk-in and class

Table T3, cont'd

	basis. We will be more attractive because of our increased technology. New learners will come to us to "learn the computer" and will read more as side benefit. *(Literacy Program/ Lifelong Learning, Seattle Public Library)*
WI	We are piloting a computer Family Literacy Program, *Families Learn and Earn*, designed to help families gain computer knowledge, upgrade job skills, and interact with their children. Designed for a business site. *(LVA Chippewa Valley/Eau Claire, Eau Claire Public Library)*
WV	We would have to pursue this through grants because we don't have the funding. *(Literacy Program, Monroe County and Peterstown Public Libraries)*

provide training..." The agency will "work to provide more libraries with Internet access." It is worthy of note that on May 29, 1996, 39 local library literacy programs in the state were listed on a Commission Internet site that also provides links to state and national resources, so that anyone with access can track down information on library literacy programs, services, and issues. (For those who want to browse, the site address is http://mlin.lib.ma.us.)

According to the Texas library agency, "distance learning technology is particularly appropriate for *rurally isolated* areas of the state. [The agency] is providing funding for public libraries to connect to the Internet, encouraging systems to collaborate with community agencies and organizations [in order] to share catalogs and resources online, and providing funds for community information referral programs in the libraries."

And in West Virginia, "over 100 public libraries in this state are downlink sites for distance education and [the agency is] incorporating technology with a literacy mission."

THE SLRC PERSPECTIVE

In general, the SLRC directors are more detailed in their thinking than the state library personnel, although now and then a curious note of complacency sets in.

Their plans fall heavily into a few broad areas: workshops... training programs and services...and activities to expand and improve information services—with occasional options for independent learning—especially via the Internet.

Plans are in the works in some cases for software evaluation and in one SLRC for the development of a media software library to which there would be statewide access.

Moreover, regional and statewide electronic networking initiatives, already in process in many of the states, would be built on in several instances. (Note that some of the thinking on this subject stems from regional demonstration grants from the National Institute for Literacy, a program that apparently recognizes the need for educators and technologists to work and think together in new ways. Libraries do not seem to be a key partner in that demonstration activity but they could be easily included.)

It is interesting that while a few SLRCs in T3 speak of planning for the greater use of computers for *instructional* purposes, the main focus, again, is on serving informational and staff training needs. It is also interesting that some of the thinking reflects a kind of pipe-dreaming that is probably unrealistic in the extreme in the present economic and political climate.

But, in a more positive vein, here are a few thought-provoking SLRC replies:

"Our Center will have a server site on the Internet in the Winter/Spring of 1996," says the Iowa SLRC. "We will position computers/modems at each community college, ABE site, and public library."

In Kentucky, "literacy providers and therefore students do not have ready access to technology hardware and courseware.

Steps have been taken to ensure that each literacy provider has computerized record-keeping capability. Funds are not available to the adult education network to keep adult students technologically literate."

"The SLRC [in Nebraska] is preparing to conduct a statewide survey of adult literacy providers...to assess existing computer use and/or access and begin to identify what is needed across the state to encourage greater use of technology. [They] hope to establish a statewide listserv available to all groups, learners, businesses, agencies. [They] are also beginning some ABE-GED staff development efforts using distance education technologies. Additional training will be provided across the state...to help familiarize people with the use of computers in an instructional/learning capacity."

The Ohio SLRC "maintains a gopher and WWW server for adult education resources. [It] provides training on the Internet for teachers, and maintains a listserv for Ohio adult literacy educators. [It is] the Regional Technology Hub for the eleven other Midwest SLRCs (NIFL grant) and will be helping them develop WWW pages, add state-specific information to the server, and work with local programs to use the resources on the Internet."

Utah is demonstrating and training adult literacy providers in the use and application of the latest technology and media ...which it has already secured. Beyond that, instructional programs are already being offered on public television and they will presumably be continued.

LOCAL PROGRAMS: TRYING TO DO THE NEARLY IMPOSSIBLE

Local library literacy program directors are the final group to be heard from on question T3.

Consistent with their low response rate earlier, there are few references here to distance learning technology or the Internet, though a few of the respondees do speak of entering these arenas.

What is evident from the responses is that most programs already use computers to some degree for either instructional or program management purposes—and this is the case whether they offer direct instructional services or function as umbrella organizations in support of such groups.

Most programs would apparently benefit from more computer usage. Some are trying to plan for that now. Others have recently concluded such planning and are taking steps to wider implementation. Still others are engaged in fundraising to this end. Some appear to be at a loss altogether about what to do and how.

For many—and this is certainly one of the most important messages of this study—**even those local library literacy programs that have concrete plans for more and better computer use and a solid base on which to build are constrained by formidable funding and space problems.** Despite their relatively good understanding and intentions, few local programs appear to have the means to finance much of anything new.

Indeed in one New Jersey program, because there are too few staff members and a heavy influx of students there is not even time to keep the records on a computer that is already dedicated to that purpose.

And for a program in Minnesota it is a "struggle to exist now. People in the community don't expect their taxes to be used for supporting administration of literacy

> For greater use of computers and distance learning technology to become a reality in this time of shrinking budgets and staff reductions there will need to be a greater degree of cooperation and collaboration. Educators, librarians, and literacy personnel need to all feel that they are important players! Establishment of linkages between literacy, library, and education on the World Wide Web can help bring these groups together. (Dan Boyd, SD)

programs. They want their donations to go for direct benefit of the student being served, or for educational materials and volunteer tutor training. Of course, this doesn't happen without administrative costs."

Programs that may be in somewhat better financial shape are not necessarily able to take giant steps either, though there are a few bright lights.

For instance, the Athens-Clarke County Public Library program in Georgia is "in the process of trying to add more computers to [its] Learning Center as well as initiate them in [its] outreach facilities/ locations. [They also] have extended satellite dish capabilities to [their] Learning Center to facilitate distance learning."

In California, the San Rafael Public Library's LVA program is "working with the local community college to use download training/in-service sessions for tutors."

And Read Write/Now of Springfield City Library in Massachusetts is "using a computer grant this year to fully develop the use of [its] 9 computers with learners. [They'll] be using a modem and gaining access to the Internet."

In only a few cases do really substantial efforts appear to be unfolding. The Literacy Center of the El Paso Public Library in Texas is one case. It "will be opening a new Literacy Center to include a 20-station computer learning lab."

Two of the most notable exceptions are literacy programs of the New York Public Library and the Free Library of Philadelphia. As their lengthy responses in Table T3 indicate, these programs have already done extensive technology planning and both are involved in ambitious implementation activities.

But they are hardly typical. One is a large direct-service urban effort and the other is a long-established city-wide resource and technical support center for surrounding provider groups. And, as will be evident later on, compared to other local programs in the study, these two are among the best funded—though they are under the same budget pressures as everyone else and do not necessarily have a secure future.

TIME & TIME AGAIN: NO MONEY!

If any doubt lingers about funding as a major obstacle to planning for and implementing computer and distance learning technology, for library literacy programs or any other purpose, the responses to the next question should dispel it.

Despite the fact that the question intentionally avoided explicit reference to funding as a possible barrier, it is crystal clear from T4 alone that **the single greatest obstacle to wider use of these technologies among *all* groups surveyed is the lack of funding**.

As analysis of Table T4 reveals, even barriers described in other terms translate into funding problems. People cannot afford to hire needed staff, seek or give training in the new technologies, buy the hardware and software in the first place, maintain it once acquired, or tie into a network of interest.

Moreover, lack of space for housing the technology and its essential supporting operations and staff is a considerable problem.

The data also suggest that a significant number of the SLRC respondents feel that there is limited understanding of and eagerness to use computers and distance learning technology, especially among provider groups.

A NEED FOR INFORMATION ABOUT GOOD MODELS

In question T5, local library literacy programs interested in increasing their technology use were asked to indicate specific programs and resources upon which they would like to model their own efforts. The question assumed that the local groups would have some familiarity with the technology usage of other programs.

The most remarkable thing about the overall response is its thinness. Only half of the respondees from question T1—where 73% of the local groups said they favored more use of computers—answered this question at all.

T4. What are the 2-3 most significant barriers you face in bringing about more, and more effective, use of computers and distance learning technology (e.g. lack of software...lack of interest among library management, librarians, or the community...lack of hardware...network access)? [Q1-Q4]

		Response	No Response
Q1	State Librarians (31 of possible 34 responded)	91%	9%
Q2	Library Agency Literacy Contact (37 of 38)	97	3
Q3	SLRC Heads (39 of 40)	98	2
Q4	Local Library Literacy Programs (54 of 59)	92	8

[Note: This question was answered primarily by persons answering "yes" to either of the questions about increased use of computers or distance learning technology. Some respondees indicating "not sure" also answered this question. Many of the respondees indicated more than one barrier.]

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
	(% of Respondees Mentioning Item)			
Lack of funding/funding uncertainties	42%	5%	51%	39%
Lack of staff/trained staff/expertise	35	22	36	31
Lack of software/quality software/affordable software	23	19	26	35
Lack of understanding re uses/value/potential of technology	19	5	8	4
Lack of hardware/funds for hardware	19	38	56	26
Lack of network access/connectivity	16	22	31	15
Lack of interest/commitment from librarians/library mgmt	13	11	8	2
Lack of suitable training services/processes	10	19	15	7
Lack of time—to learn new technologies/undertake new services	10	3	3	7
Lack of information about resources/quality programs & models	10	16	15	2
Lack of community/general awareness	6	5	8	4
Need for more partnerships/collaborative efforts	6	5	3	
Infrastructure—variations in service from place to place	6	5		
Lack of resources/technology for non-literacy library services	3	3		
Lack of resources in remote areas	3			
Lack of space	3	14		26
Need for strategic planning/or a state plan	3		3	
Enabling legislation at state/federal levels	3			
Need for success stories to be publicized	3			
Need for adaptation/use of WWW technology	3	3		
Use of technology still at experimental level	3			
Fear of/discomfort with/resistance to computers	3	16	10	4
Main barriers are human; not technical	3			
Disarray in state government about who has responsibility	3			
Overcoming hype		3		
Overcoming territoriality		3	3	
Librarians won't let literacy personnel use their computers		3		
Volunteers/literacy educators reluctant/unable to use computers		5	5	6
Lack of understanding/interest among service providers			13	2
Lack of knowledge/understanding/experience			8	2
Sense of futility—everything's gong down the drain			3	
Programs don't even have modems			3	
Unequal/lack of access to technology			3	
Limited transportation prevents access				2
Lack of buy-in			3	
Limited media support			3	
Lack of trained creative service providers			3	
Rapidity of changes in technology field			3	2
Lack of hardware/software standardization/ research outdated before it can be implemented			3	2
Learners have little interest in computers				2
Administrative priorities				2
Rural areas hae special/needs and problems, often not recognized				4
Reliability of hardware/software & time spent troubleshooting				2
Student recruitment				2

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

T5. If you want to increase your use of technology, indicate any programs or specific resources currently using technology, if any, upon which you would like to model your technology program. [Local Programs, Q4 only]

We would like to have a computer lab with staff on site. We currently have computers for literacy instruction in two branches. They are not used as well as they could be. *(Partners in Reading, San Jose Public Library, CA)*

There is already a Justin Lab in our town so another program would be better. Haven't chosen any specific one yet. The school list has computers but most are not available for public use. *(Literacy Program, Mesa County Public Library District, CO)*

A learning laboratory. *(Hillsborough Literacy Council, Tampa-Hillsborough County Library System, FL)*

Learning center-family oriented. Educational software. *(Panhandle Library Literacy Consortium, Jefferson County Public Library, FL)*

NCAL. *(Libraries for Literacy in Lake County, Waukegan Public Library, IL)*

We would like to purchase more PLATO software, the ESL Ellis program, and more video tapes for use in our ESL program. *(Project Finish, Johnson County Library, KS)*

What our learners want to do is what most people want to do with computers—word processing. *(Read Write/Now Program, Springfield City Library-Mason Sq. Branch, MA)*

There are other technological solutions besides computers. My students find little hand-held "language masters" and translators very helpful. For some students, this is a better solution. *(Center for New Americans, Jones Library, MA)*

Programs utilizing all technologies where learners can relate via modem, in person, or by voice mail—crucial. *(Franklin Learning Center, Franklin Community Library, Minneapolis Public Library, MN)*

I don't know what is available. *(Literacy Center of Prendergast Library, NY)*

We are the model. *(Literacy Program, Brooklyn Public Library, NY)*

We would like to connect with programs who are using technology in ways that are compatible with our instructional approaches. The Brooklyn Public Library recently redesigned the technology component of their program—there are aspects of that program that we would like to incorporate into ours. *(Centers for Reading and Writing, New York Public Library, NY)*

One in the Fayetteville, AR library. *(Great Plains Literacy Council, Southern Prairie Library System, OK)*

Have not researched specific programs. There is no point until it becomes feasible for our program. The materials, software and hardware, are increasing at such a fast rate that research would be outdated before it could be implemented. *(Literacy Council of LeFlore County, Buckley Public Library, OK)*

LCC-Emerald Job Center (AFS). LCC Training & Development (displaced worker). *(LEARN Project, Eugene Public Library, OR)*

RDP has requested information from the Library of Michigan regarding its 7 Internet training centers. If relevant, RDP will adapt the training which is designed for all potential users. *(Reader Development Program, Free Library of Philadelphia, PA)*

Several programs in the state use technology, but most of these are large, urban programs. I'm not aware of any smaller, rural library based programs using technology. *(Bradford-Wyoming County Literacy Program, Bradford County Library, PA)*

The El Paso Community College, El Paso Independent School District, and West-Texas Community Supervision and Corrections Department have learning labs which will be used as models for our technology program. *(Literacy Center, El Paso Public Library, TX)*

We are looking at a phonics program (HEC) out of Utah, and the STAR program. *(Bridgerland Literacy, Logan Library, UT)*

Computerized adult testing, assessment and skills enhancement software on disks for pre-GED and Levels I and II and basic literacy. *(Literacy Program, Newport News Public Library, VA)*

Still learning. Any suggestions? *(Literacy Program, Seattle Public Library, WA)*

The T4 summary of barriers identifies critical areas that need attention. The Clinton administration is pushing technology use in schools... why not in libraries? A case can be made. (Jim Parker, U.S. Department of Education)

Moreover, some said straight out that they don't know or aren't yet aware of what might be available. Others make broad references to wanting learning centers or labs without citing any particular models...to wanting *all* the technology available...to wishing for computer software of one kind or another without connecting software type to need...to an array of wish-list items.

Only a small handful of the responses can be construed as showing real knowledge of how other programs are currently using technology and whether these models might be usefully applied locally.

One need that jumps out from Table T5 is the need for leadership to identify successful technology applications in adult literacy settings and communicate that to local programs in a clear and usable form.

JOINING FORCES TO IMPROVE THE PROSPECTS

In question T6, SLRC heads were asked in what way they would work with their state library agency and local libraries to implement effective use of technology in library literacy programs. And in T6a, local programs were asked essentially the same thing, but with reference to a wider range of groups.

T6. In what way would you work with the state library agency and local libraries to implement effective use of technology in library literacy programs? [SLRC, Q3 only]

(Note: 35 respondees, 88% response rate. Some respondees gave more than one answer.)

Provide/share information on technology libraries/provide technical assistance (CO, DE, FL, IL, KY, NH, VA)

Engage in planning and development work with them (CT, MI, MN, UT, WI)

Provide training/staff training (IA, OH, OK, SD, KY)

Work to expand Internet access for state libraries/local programs/teachers/students (NC, NM, TN, VA)

Draw libraries into NIFL-funded electronic hub we are developing (AZ,CA, TN)

Coordinate teleconferences/resources/equipment use (CO, OH, OK)

Work to develop distance learning opportunities for/at library sites (NC, SD)

Seek technology help from them—they have more resources & expertise (CO)

Take part in technological network (AL)

Link with them for loans and circulation (CT)

Provide information to teachers about library programs (DE)

Encourage use (IA)

Conduct how-to-use computer workshops/services (IN)

Hold jointly sponsored workshops and training (NJ)

Merge with network of state library agency and local libraries so as to better communciate with local providers (MD)

Seek and/or offer funds to get local libraries on the Internet (MT)

Plan comprehensively to share resources, training, advocacy (ND)

Help assess hardware and software needs (NE)

Help develop linkages with state library system (NE)

Develop ABE software and video collections that can be viewed by local programs (NJ)

Offer same services any other ABE/literacy program is given (PA)

Provide computer access to material (SD)

Having SLRC records built into the library database (VA)

Expand tutoring and training services at local library sites (WV)

Not sure (MO)

Not applicable/as applicable (AK, MS,VT)

> I was surprised in the technology area that funding was such a significant problem. I had mistakenly assumed that libraries and other programs often had access to sources of funds for technology and that obtaining specific equipment was not usually a problem. Clearly, the study indicates that funding of actual hardware is a challenge for many and often a critical problem. (Peter Waite, Laubach Literacy Action)

Again, assuming the financial capacity to do so, SLRCs would concentrate their efforts in a few areas: planning and development ...staff and tutor training ...sharing of expertise, materials, and other resources...provision of information and workshops on computers and technology... teleconferencing and communications activities... assessment of hardware and software needs... advocacy...development of Internet access and computer networking... and building links between and among state and local libraries, the SLRC, and other groups.

The SLRCs would apparently take basic responsibility for *initiating* and/or providing some of these services, but they also appreciate the need to work *with* the libraries—in cooperative planning, joint sponsorship of workshops, and the like.

They would in fact look *to* the libraries for help in some instances, however, believing them to have the superior technology resources and expertise—and in a few cases the state libraries are seen as holding the key to statewide access to materials. The Virginia SLRC would even like to have its materials drawn into the library database to make them more widely available—an interesting idea highlighted earlier.

Indeed, imbedded in the responses of many of the SLRCs is a sense that libraries have space and facilities that they themselves do not have but from which they and adult literacy groups around the state could benefit. Considering that so many SLRCs are in abysmal financial straits, as will soon be evident, it is surprising that more of them did not explicitly say this.

In T6a, the thinking of local library literacy programs is identical in some respects to that of the SLRCs. Uppermost in their minds is the sharing of training, materials, or other resources, and staff development and training. Also of high interest is participation in state and local planning.

But local groups differ in some major ways as well. Not surprisingly, as local providers they are much more likely to *need* the services and resources of other groups than to be a *source* of help. They also name fundraising as a priority area of activity, and condition their other activities on being successful in this one. Clearly, however, they are ready and eager for meaningful new engagements, even wanting in a couple of cases to serve as demonstration sites.

The heavy need of local groups for help in identifying and developing appropriate software is underscored again in T6a. About 25%

T6a. In what way would you work with local or state groups (e.g. the state library agency, local libraries, the state literacy resource center or statewide planning body, etc.) to implement effective use of technology in your program? [Local Programs, Q4]

(Note: 42 of the 63 program directors taking part in the survey answered the question, for a response rate of 67%. Some respondees gave more than one answer.)

Share tutor technical training, curriculum, educational software, information, facilities, publications (AR, GA, MA, MN, NE, NJ, OR, PA)

Engage in staff development, and volunteer/staff training activities. (DE, FL, GA, VA)

Identify and develop appropriate computer software program for program management purposes (CA)

Work to develop better software; what's available isn't impressive (MA)

Turn to one or both of them, or a regional SLRC equivalent, as a source of instructional videos/software, in-service workshops, and/or evaluation of videos and software (CA, CA, KS, OK, OR, WA)

Develop instructional training videos (MA)

Develop information videos for the learning disabled (MA)

State library is a funding source/potential funding source (CA, MA)

Seek funds for trained personnel to implement technology we already have and provide staff technical training (FL

Work with local school district or community college to be the downlink, if funds can be found to purchase the service (MI)

Serve as a demonstration site, if funding is available, to show how a public library can offer adult literacy instruction using the most technologically advanced methods. Otherwise work with local providers to develop and implement technological resources (FL, GA)

Seek help with fundraising (GA)

Involve adult learners in considering how computers are best used in their learning/work with State Library and adult learners to fully develop the use of computers we already have (CA, MA)

Develop cooperative student recruitment activities (FL)

Explore how to effectively incorporate families into a computer program (CA)

Join/remain active in/host statewide or local planning activities for improved use of technology/participate in advisory groups to this end (CA, MN, NY, OR, TX, WI)

Work with cooperative technology team whose members are located near one another (MA)

Work with one or both groups to develop staff training/support/effective use of Internet/develop Internet access (AR, CA, MA, MN, OK, RI)

Work with state library to develop Internet ESL services (MA)

Table T6a, cont'd

Encourage and work with state library to mount an information site on the Internet, coordinate a listserv (NC)

Request/provide information about effective basic reading and ESL software (NM, RI)

Provide local and regional technology consulting services to SLRC and and libraries (CO)

Work to preserve the integrity of this community and the larger ecology it is part of. Computers are seductive, but can't learn or teach for us. They can homogenize our culture and dispossess vital small communities of their memories and meanings (IN)

Seek technical assistance help to develop a more comprehensive component to our technology program—to identify appropriate hardware/software, evaluate students' use of computers, improve and refine training activities, and develop linkages to other literacy groups trying to implement technology (NY)

Seek cooperation of the state library literacy office in researching programs throughout the state that might be adapted to use in ours (OK)

Reach out to/network with local programs that can show us how computers and distance learning technology would be useful to programs like ours (NY, WV)

Encourage and participate in networking to reduce problem of library literacy programs being isolated from one another (NY)

Develop easy-to-understand voter information (MA)

Seek training and technical assistance from state library (WV)

Undertake joint awareness/advocacy activities (FL)

There is no time or personnel, nor a secure computer (NJ)

We would help ourselves (UT)

of the respondees want to work with state level groups in developing video and computer software for instructional, training, program management, or informational purposes. They know firsthand that the wares being promoted by software manufacturers and others are too often not suitable for their purposes and adult constituencies.

The desire is also strong to work with the SLRCs and libraries to develop Internet access and services, and to develop network linkages to other local library literacy programs. In fact, a number of the responses reveal that local programs suffer from working in isolation from one another.

It should be noted that to save space, Tables T6 and T6a are distillations of much longer tables from the background data book. To illustrate the flavor of some of those first-person responses, however, here is a sampling from the data book:

The Illinois SLRC is "gathering data and technology features of public and school libraries in communities with funded literacy programs to evaluate current capabilities, provide the appropriate materials, look at the potential, and identify resources to reach that potential. [They] will know from this information what types of materials to purchase for the state resource center collection."

"The Maryland State Library Agency and local libraries are operating The Sailor Network that [the SLRC] will merge with to communicate with local providers."

The Tennessee SLRC is "involved in developing a World Wide Web-based infrastructure of literacy and adult basic education stakeholders, in cooperation with the National Institute for Literacy. As this work expands to the regional and local level, [they] will involve libraries in training and using the Internet, specifically the Literacy Information and Communications System (LINCS)."

"The state library agency relationship [in West Virginia] has not been strong," says the SLRC head there. "Local libraries can (and sometimes do) serve as community sites for training and tutoring. This could be expanded."

A common frustration expressed by the San Jose Public Library Partners in Reading program is a concern about the lack of effective administrative software for program management. "The California State Library contracted with a software developer over five years ago to create a [computer] program," she said, "but it had so many problems that most [literacy] programs abandoned it. We now each have to 'reinvent the wheel' to get software that collects the data and creates the reports we need for accountability. Much administrative time is spent collecting data for a variety of funders, and the data requested is different for each."

The Center for Adult Learning in Florida's Jacksonville Public Library "was initiated in 1984 as a demonstration project under an LSCA Title I grant from the state library. [They] would be thrilled to be given the opportunity to become a demonstration project again as an example of how a public library can offer instruction to adults in the most technologically advanced methods. Over the past 11 years, many other public libraries have come to [them] for advice and recommendations in setting up similar literacy programs."

The MARC Literacy Program of the Greenville Public Library in Michigan "can arrange with [its] local school district or community college to be the downlink, but [they] don't have the money to purchase the service." They propose to work on a committee to investigate networking and ways to reduce costs to potential users.

"If there were any state programs that would show us how technology would be useful to us," says the Prendergast Library literacy program, "we would like to take part. In Western New York, library-sponsored literacy programs seem isolated from one another. There is little networking with the state or with other libraries."

And the Readers Development Program in Philadelphia "will continue to work cooperatively with the National Center on Adult Literacy, the Mayor's Commission on Literacy, Drexel University's Community Outreach program, and other literacy groups in Philadelphia."

Finally, one of the most haunting and unforgettable passages of this entire study. It comes from the Knox County Public Library in Vincennes, Indiana, and serves to remind everyone that technology is not a panacea. It also is an admonition: the benefits of technology use need to be tempered by a sober realization that some applications have the power to destroy important human values! The director of the literacy program there puts it this way:

"[We will work] in ways that preserve the integrity of this community and the larger ecology it is part of. Computers are very seductive, but they can't learn for us or teach for us, and they run the risk of homogenizing our culture, dispossessing vital small communities of their memories and meaning, in order to be able to reach their audience."

3: PLANNING

Section 3 looks at the planning context in which library literacy programs operate. One cluster of questions considers if and to what extent the state libraries are involved in statewide planning for adult literacy.

Another cluster examines the degree to which, in the eyes of state librarians and their literacy staffs, state libraries have regular working relations with key state and national literacy, library, and political entities, including SLRCs.

A third line of questioning focuses specifically on SLRCs, the groups established by the National Literacy Act as the state-level counterparts to the National Institute for Literacy.

SLRCs were included in the study because they were presumed to have the central statewide planning and resource development role envisioned for them in their enabling legislation. If they are operating as intended, it would be impossible to consider the present and future circumstances of state libraries and library literacy programs without also considering theirs.

It should be noted that at the time the survey was taken, a few of the responding SLRCs had either already closed due to lack of funding or were on the verge of doing so. Their heads/former heads were invited to participate in the study anyway because of the valuable perspectives they could contribute.

STATE LIBRARIES IN STATEWIDE PLANNING

According to SLRCs in the 40 states involved in this study, **32 states (85%) have a statewide planning body** or some kind of coordinated mechanism for integrated planning and resource development (P1). On the face of it, this is very encouraging news. (The states reported *not* to have such a capacity are Connecticut, Kansas, North Dakota, New Hampshire, Ohio, and Tennessee.)

Moreover, **the majority of state library agencies appear to be involved in that statewide planning**.

P1. Does your state have a statewide literacy planning body or some coordinated mechanism for integrated planning and resource development? [SLRC, Q3]

		Yes	No	Not Sure
Q3	SLRCs (40 of 40 responded)	85%	15%	0

P2. Is your (state library agency, SLRC) a member of a/the statewide literacy planning body/structure in your state? [Q1-Q3]

		Yes	No	Not Sure
Q1	State Librarians (35 of 35)	86%	14%	0
Q2	Library Agency Literacy Contacts (34 of 44)	76	21	3
Q3	SLRC Heads (39 of 40)	77	23	0

P3. Which of the following organizations in your state are involved in cooperative statewide planning, policy, and resource development? [Q3 only]

Q3 SLRCs (39 of 40, 98% response rate)

	% of Respondees Citing Item
State department of education/ABE division	90%
Other state agencies/departments	80
Voluntary literacy groups (e.g. LVA, Laubach)	75
State library agency	69
Governor's office	67
Community-based organizations	67
Community Colleges	56
Businesses in the state	49
Local libraries	44
4-year colleges/universities	44
Schools	41
State legislature	39
State/local ESL groups	39
State Center for the Book	5
Other	8

The library personnel say (in P2) that most state libraries are members of this statewide literacy planning body (from 76%-86% of them). Curiously, there is a signficant difference in the positive response rates of librarians and their designated literacy professionals. Moreover, *all* state librarians responded to the question, while only 77% of library agency literacy professionals did. One can only speculate on the meaning of these differences. One group appears to be better informed than the other. Again, it would seem that communications between the two levels could be better than it is.

Not shown in Table P2, but evident in the background data, is another curious inconsistency. Librarians indicate no involvement in state planning in Iowa, Maryland, New Mexico, Oregon, and Texas. But the library agency literacy personnel named only two of those states as uninvolved (Maryland and Texas) and added four others (Connecticut, Kentucky, New York, and South Carolina), none of which were cited by their bosses.

P3a. Which organizations in the state regularly receive adult literacy services from the SLRC and/or from OTHER STATE ENTITIES? [Q3 only]

Q3 (39 of 40 responded, 98%)	SLRC	Other State Entities
Community-based organizations	95%	51%
Voluntary literacy groups (e.g. LVA, Laubach)	92	49
Other state agencies/depts.	90	51
State education department/ ABE division	85	46
Local libraries	77	39
State/local ESL groups	77	39
Schools	77	46
Community colleges	74	46
Businesses in the state	69	41
State library agency	67	33
4-year colleges/universities	62	39
Governor's office	59	31
State legislature	39	28
State Center for the Book	18	8
Other	13	3

P4. With which of the following organizations in the STATE does the STATE LIBRARY maintain ongoing working relations to plan for and othewise advance adult literacy? [Q1-Q2]

Q1 (32 of 35 responded, 91%) Q2 (38 of 44 responded, 86%)	State Librarian	Library Agency Literacy Contact
SLRC	77%	70%
ABE/State Education Department	77	73
Governor's office	66	55
Voluntary groups	66	55
ESL organizations	43	32
Businesses in the state	40	39
State legislature	49	41
Community colleges	37	41
Other	26	27

Furthermore, only one state named by state library literacy respondees as uninvolved, Connecticut, was also named by the SLRCs. This variance suggests again that a good many of the respondees aren't adequately informed about the library planning role—pointing again to inadequate communications between and among the groups, and also suggesting that many SLRCs may be sideline participants rather than active leaders of statewide planning, something that later data will show to be the case.

Nevertheless, the majority of state library agencies do seem to have at least some involvement in statewide planning. And the point is further reinforced by the SLRCs in Table P3. Here they indicate that nearly 70% of state library agencies are involved in statewide planning, policy, and resource development.

Furthermore, their response indicates that **state libraries are more involved than all other groups in the state** — including governor's offices—except for state departments of education, other state agencies, and voluntary literacy organizations (LVA and Laubach).

Three other findings are significant as well. First and foremost, the dominant role of state education departments literally jumps off the page. Second, some 44% of local libraries appear to have a voice in statewide planning, a pleasant if unexpected finding. Third, according to the SLRCs, nearly 50% of the statewide planning that regularly occurs across the country has *business* involvement, a much larger involvement than expected.

Back to the main point, though, whatever the problems and inconsistencies, *more* involvement of the libraries is better than *less* from the standpoint of developing their role in adult literacy. There is evidently a substantial base on which to build. What is less clear is what that involvement adds up to in terms of having a real voice in the literacy affairs of the state. Data gathered elsewhere in the study suggest that although there are many firmly committed state libraries/librarians, the engagement of many others is superficial.

THE SLRC ROLE

Questions P3a, P4, and P5 look at the service and planning role of the SLRCs with respect to libraries and other groups in the states from two perspectives: that of library agency personnel and that of the SLRCs themselves. Four interrelated issues are probed:

Which groups most benefit from the SLRCs services? To what extent do the public libraries benefit? What is the nature and extent of the SLRC service/technical assistance role as compared to other state sources? And, if the

P5. Congress has cut funding for the SLRCs beginning next year. These centers were a major provision of the National Literacy Act of 1991 which recognized the need for state-level counterparts to the National Institute for Literacy. The centers are presently at various stages of development. Some will survive the federal funding withdrawal, others may not. If the library agency has a strong working relationship with the SLRC, please indicate as best you can what kind of help the SLRC gives you at present (e.g. planning and policy assistance, resource development, program/staff development, help in adapting research to practice). [Q1, Q2]

Q1 State Librarians (25 of 35, 71%)
Q2 State Agency Literacy Contacts (41 of 44, 93%)

	Q1	Q2
	(# of times cited)	
None (AL, NE, RI, FL, NJ, TX, VA)	3	4
Very little (FL, WI, HI, LA, MA, SC, TN, WV, WI)	2	7
Provides statistics, research data, and other information (AR, MS, TN, CO, ID, MD, MO, OR)	3	6
The State Library is the literacy resource center (DC, HI, IL, MT, OK)	4	2
The Center has closed/may close due to federal funding cuts (FL, GA, IL)	3	1
Resources/resource development (LA, ND, NH, PA, MN, ND, SD)	4	3
Provide/support training and staff development (MI, MS, NH, PA, MO, WA)	4	2
Planning and coordination (MI, PA, TN, CA, OR)	3	2
Sharing of staff, space, cataloguing, and other resources (MN, OH, SD, IN, OH, SD)	4	2
Give us access to instructional networks/help bring library services and materials collections to the attention of local literacy programs/ make hotline referrals to local programs (WV, IA, ID, IN, MS, NY)	2	4
Help in developing collections (CO, WA)		2
We can borrow from their materials collection (IN, NM)		2
Awareness/promotes understanding and awareness of need for services within the library community (MN, WY)		2
Disseminate data on effective techniques and programs (MI)	1	
They give us a presence in literacy circles (IA)	1	
Evaluation of programs (MI)	1	
They mobilize phone and letter campaigns for legislative influence (NH)	1	
Interlibrary loans (NV)	1	
Provide technical assistance to local library literacy programs (PA)	1	
Help adapt research to practice (PA)	1	
It is the lead agency in our state (IA)	1	
Provides basic consulting services (IN)		1
Program development help (NH)		1
They are a source of grant reviewers (NY)		1
They include their material in our database, thus increasing statewide access to literacy information and services (VT)		1
They sponsor conferences we attend (VT)		1
Don't know (OR)	1	
Not applicable (AK)	1	

Note: This table is a distillation of responses that appear in original form in the background data book.

P6. With which of the following NATIONAL organizations does the STATE LIBRARY maintain ongoing working relations to plan for and otherwise advance adult literacy? [Q1-Q2]

Q1 State Librarians (31 of 35 responded, 88%)
Q2 State Agency Literacy Contact (33 of 44, 75%)

	State Librarian	Library Agency Literacy Contact
American Library Association	80%	59%
U.S. Department of Education	80	59
National Center for Library & Information Sciences (NCLIS)	54	32
Center for the Book	54	43
LVA/Laubach	46	32
National Institute for Literacy	40	30
Businesses	31	11
National Center for Adult Literacy	29	18
National Coalition for Literacy	20	11
Clearinghouse for Adult Literacy/ESL Education of Center for Applied Linguistics	17	9
Other	6	9

P6a. With which of the following NATIONAL organizations does the SLRC maintain ongoing working relations to plan for and otherwise advance adult literacy? [Q3 only]

Q3 SLRCs (39 of 40 responded, 98%)

U.S. Department of Education	95%
National Institute for Literacy	93
National Center for Adult Literacy	83
LVA/Laubach	70
Clearinghouse for Adult Literacy/ESL Education of Center for Applied Linguistics	50
Businesses	48
National Coalition for Literacy	30
U.S. Department of Labor	28
National Governor's Association	25
U.S. Congress	23
U.S. Department of Health & Human Services	18
American Library Association	10
NCLIS	10
Center for the Book	10
Other	8

SLRCs have the key role now, can libraries (along with other literacy stakeholders in the states) count on them as a continuing source of leadership and help?

Of great importance, SLRCs and library personnel alike see SLRCs as the main source of planning and resource development help to libraries and other literacy stakeholders in their states.

Beyond this, several of the specific findings are quite dramatic: Community-based organizations and voluntary literacy groups rely to an extraordinary degree on the SLRCs. So do state education departments and other state agencies. It is easy to see why considering that some 40% of SLRCs are units within (controlled by) state education departments (Table P9).

State and local ESL groups, schools, and community colleges also get substantial SLRC support, as do local libraries and the state library agencies. Indeed, library groups apparently get twice as much support from SLRCs as from all other state entities combined.

TIES THAT BIND: STATE-LEVEL LINKS

The library personnel were asked with which of several state organizations they maintain working relations *to plan for and otherwise advance adult literacy.*

SLRCs and state education departments (virtually the same thing in 40% of the cases) rank way at the top. Next in the ranking are governor's offices and voluntary organizations, though state librarians see a stronger

P6b. In a sentence or two, what kind of national-level help not now being provided would the state library agency like to have? [Q1, Q2]

DE Grants to local libraries or state library agencies for literacy programming. (Q1)

DE More assistance in developing and promoting information on literacy programs. (Q2)

IL It would make life simpler if at least some of the national organizations could adopt a collaborative approach and future planning mechanism (i.e. decide jointly what they can offer to state and local programs after input from programs and then delegate functions so there's less duplication and their services get to programs). (Q2)

IN We need greater coordination of programs and efforts from the various national level organizations. Our resources are too limited to pick and choose who and what we can support. (Q1)

OH Over the years different staff have had the responsibility to work with literacy. An ALA-sponsored training program in the late 70's was attended by our staff. Staff have also written documents on literacy which have been distributed not only in state but made available to requesters across the nation. Not sure what is available from all the organizations. (Q1, Q2)

OK National awareness and promotion of volunteer and library-based literacy programs is needed. (Q2)

OR We are satisfied with our contacts at the national level. (Q1)

TX Funding and/or materials. (Q2)

working link in these cases than their literacy professionals do. Similarly, state librarians are much more likely to perceive a working relationship with ESL organizations in their states (43%) than do their library literacy personnel (32%). The differences are important, especially in the ESL area, though not directly explainable from the data gathered.

The two groups of library personnel were also asked what *kind* of help they presently get from the SLRCs.

A number of respondees in both categories indicated that they receive no assistance or very little. It is odd, however, that in only one state (Wisconsin) do Q1 and Q2 groups both give this response. Again, there is reason to believe that some of the responses here, as elsewhere, are guesses rather than informed answers.

Nevertheless, there is nearly total agreement on how they most benefit from the help of the SLRCs: research and information services... resource development assistance...staff development and training... and planning and coordination generally—the very services that SLRCs were legislated to provide.

The SLRCs are also seen as important to developing and providing access to library collections—with the libraries in some cases being able to draw on SLRC collections. Indeed, *sharing* of collections and other resources, including staff, is an oft-cited gain.

Coordination at the national level is critical since what happens there will determine the roles at the state level. The survey data includes comments again and again on the unrest of the future of funding, the need to maximize any available funding, and the need for coordination. [A quote from] South Dakota captures the dilemma: *The leadership for a secure funding base needs to come from the federal level. Illiteracy is not a Democratic or Republican issue. It affects all citizens and impacts our economic growth.* (Bridget Lamont, State Librarian, IL)

TIES THAT BIND: NATIONAL LINKS

One would expect *local* library literacy programs to work more with groups at the local and state levels, but effective leadership and planning by *state-level* entities requires strong ties to the national organizations where overall policy and funding decisions are shaped.

Thus, in P6 and P6a state library people and the SLRCs were asked if they work on a regular basis with a wide range of key national literacy, library, and government organizations.

There are profound differences of opinion between the two library groups. A full 80% of state librarians say that they have strong working relations with both the American Library Association and the U.S. Department of Education. Less than 60% of the library literacy contacts think so. Some 54% of the librarians say that their State Agency also has strong links with the National Center for Libraries & Information Science (NCLIS). This tie is much lower according to state agency literacy professionals.

Both categories of library respondents are probably right. State librarians would reasonably be expected to have a larger sense, in general, of their organization's national working ties. But their literacy staffs almost certainly understand better whether the connections are for the purpose of "advancing adult literacy." Even granting this explanation, however, information gathered from consultations with the Office of Educational Research and Improvement and others

P7. Federal funding for the SLRCs was rescinded for FY95 and has not yet been appropriated for FY96. The centers are presently (as of 10/26/95) reauthorized for the period 1997-2002 in bills now pending in the House and Senate. There is thus some chance that funding will be restored in 1997. Moreover, one bill presently under consideration would not place the provision for the centers in block grant funding to the states. The SLRCs are presently at various stages of development. Some are more vulnerable than others to federal funding decisions. How has your center and the state's adult literacy affairs already been affected by current federal cuts; what does the future hold if funding is not restored? [Q3 only]

Q3 SLRCs (38 of 40 responded, 95%)

Note: The Georgia SLRC did not respond to the survey questionnaire at all, but a separate communication from a state official is included in this table for the information it provides.

AL N.R.

AK We (the SLRC) give 100% of our funds to our regional center (Northwest Regional Literacy Resource Center at network in Seattle) so the funding cut will not affect statewide operations.

AZ [The] Adult Literacy & Technology Resource Center, Inc. [has already] lost $103,722.

CA SLRC-California is now in 3rd year of federal funding and is secure as exists now through September 1996. If funding is not allocated as specific set-aside in block grants, not yet clear at what level SLRC will be maintained. Clearly will not disappear but not sure at exactly what level funding will be. The State Collaborative Literacy Council, which was created to administer SLRC, is committed to continuing the effort no matter what happens to federal $ but has not yet been able to develop a concrete plan for beyond Sept. 30, 1996.

CO Direct effects not yet felt, but since we are totally federally funded, loss of these dollars means our demise. Block grants to governor's office more than likely dooms us as well. We have lost adult education for homeless $.

CT Funding for the position of state literacy coordinator and for materials is gone. If federal funding is not restored, the literacy resource center will continue to be funded by the Capitol Region Education Council and by sale of services to agency members of the Resource Center. This is the means currently being employed to sustain the Center for FY95-96.

DE Caused 50% staff reduction. Limited research time. Funding permits some operation until 9/30/96. Center will probably close if not funded.

FL The Florida Adult Literacy Resource Center closed July 31, 1995 as a result of the federal budget rescission of 1995. This took away a catalyst which was just beginning to inform a well-developed public/private partnership. This took the better part of three years. Loss of this resource will set the state's literacy delivery system back to its former random and inequitable approach to development. (former director, FL SLRC)

GA Letter from Asst Commissioner: The Georgia Literacy Resource Center is temporarily closed, due to termination of federal funding. Center activities will resume as funds are identified and made available, and program operations restructured to meet program goals. Currently, ongoing staff development workshops for adult literacy practitioners are being developed and conducted at the resource center as part of our adult literacy program activities. Specific program operations will resume contingent upon the new funding sources.

HI N.R.

IA No impact through June 1996. Then , 50-75% cut in funds anticipated: reduction in staff, services, acquisition. Operations will be restricted to maintenance level: check-in/out, little if any acquisition, promotion etc. unless funding restored.

suggests that the library literacy respondents are too high in their estimates as well.

Consider the following: In the 1980s, the American Library Assocation visibly championed the cause of literacy, with its Ad Council campaign igniting an adult literacy movement that had remained on the march until recently stalled by federal funding and policy changes. Many persons interviewed, however, believe that the ALA "dropped the ball" and is not currently a major literacy force—at least not in a way that would call for substantial state library involvement.

[Note: In fact, the ALA's focus over the past five years has been family literacy, with most of the adult literacy budget devoted to that. Moreover, the ALA has always been and still is the glue that holds together the National Coalition for Literacy.]

What about the U.S. Department of Education link? On the one hand, it is hard to imagine that the working relationship *for literacy purposes* is very deep, considering that Title VI of the Library

Table P7, cont'd

IL Depending on the legislation which emerges related to State Resource Centers, our agency may or may not be the SRC in the future. If dollars for SRC's go to SEA's that agency in Illinois will probably operate the SRC. The work we've done over the past 3 1/2 years will impact the way that ISBE would run a state resource center. We anticipate that services of the SLRC would be open to all partners in the adult literacy/education arena and not just LEA's There would also be an emphasis on funding projects or activities in the train-the-trainer mode. The Interagency Coordinating Committee of the Illinois Literacy Council would presumably continue in some form to ensure this ongoing coordination.

IN Change of administration. Reduction in staff (from 10 to 2.5). Additional potential downsizing if funding not restored.

KS Our SLRC was an expansion of the existing Adult Education Resource Center funded with 353 funds. When the federal funds dry up, it will go back to being the Adult Education Resource Center if Adult Ed funds can still be used for that purpose under the new legislation.

KY The Kentucky Center for Adult Education and Literacy will continue services to local providers at a minimal level. The materials collection will be maintained, with few new acquisitions. Newsletters, publications, and trainings will be continued through cost recovery. Technical assistance, research, and policy planning will be continued as special project funds are received.

LA Unless the 1996 Regular Session of the Legislature restores General Fund will take office on January 8.

MD Federal funding for the SLRC ended June 30, 1995. As a result, services have been reduced. Currently monies are being used to provide a comprehensive professional staff development program. We have limited materials purchasing and distribution and have consolidated three regional centers into two.

MI The State of Michigan immediately replaced much of the "lost" federal funds and our Dept. of Education will continue to do so. Budgets will be reduced by 1/2 in the future (beginning in January). Result: services to the field will be fee-based, graduate assistantships go from 2 to 1, will not be sponsoring dissertation research, will not be sponsoring teacher field-based inquiry.

MN Our budget has been cut to about a third of its previous level, and our staff has been cut from two to one person. We are currently funded with section 353 money. Complicating matters in MN, our Department of Education was abolished as of 9/30/95, and we now have a Department of Children, Families, and Learning. The new department combines the old dept. of ed. with programs related to youth and families from Health and Human Services, and Labor. With this restructuring is a reexamination of how the agency is spending its dollars. Combined with the uncertain federal situation, I am pessimistic about our center's ability to continue without the reauthorization and set-aside funding. Our center is too new to be effective at finding alternative (non-government) funding sources.

MO We are a nonprofit and raise funds year round. State has begun giving small grant ($70,000). State DESE helps with funds. Adult literacy has gone to the state for an increase in funding to compensate for loss of [federal] funds.

MS Shaky. We have funding for some staff through June 30, 1996. We are writing grant applications for FY96-97. We have proposed legislation being written.

MT So far, not affected. We did not use 1994 funding, and we have requested and received permission to extend period of time during which these funds may be expended.

NC Because we are very new (June 1994) we are still using FY1994 funds and will be in business through Sept. 1996. After that our future is unclear. If federal funding is restored, we are likely to remain operative; if not I do not know what will happen. NC is undergoing changes in community college structures which would affect us, and the Workforce Commission may want to redesign our affiliation.

Services & Construction Act (LSCA) is the only funding ever designated for library literacy *and* that the bulk of the funds (94%) has been administered directly to local programs instead of state libraries.

On the other hand, it is signifianct that OERI has required all local proposals to be "commented on" by their respective state libraries as a condition of LSCA funding, so even though the state libraries have not had a review and approval role, OERI's local grants have been made with their full awareness and support. Moreover, national panels set up by OERI for proposal review purposes have had some state library representation over the years. So, the working relationship between the Department and the libraries is real if not extensive.

[Note: LSCA Title VI funding was recently shifted to Title I, but it is not earmarked for literacy, partly because the ALA's Washington Office doesn't favor earmarks in the present economic and polical climate.]

The NCLIS, a major force in the library world,

Table P7, cont'd

ND N.R.

NE Presently, we have already experienced a reduction in the kinds and amount of staff development opportunities we can offer. We have reduced Center staffing (some clerical support) and have reassessed our priorities in terms of purchasing materials for program use across the state. We anticipate continuing to function as the SLRC through next spring, using carry-over monies from FY94-95, but with a reduction in outreach. Future: When these funds have been exhausted, we will revert back to the primary research and development function which our Institute held prior to being identified as the SLRC for Nebraska. This would mean no longer purchasing materials for use in the lending library, further reductions in staff, and reducing or eliminating many other outreach efforts.

NH The Center was not funded for FY96. The Center will continue to be closed if funding is not restored.

NJ Our SLRC is currently operating on FY94 grant monies. Thus all SLRC functions related to training and technical assistance will continue. These functions are currently supported by funds provided through the Adult Education Act, Section 353, and will not be affected if funds are not restored. Activities related to governmental and agency cooperation will continue, but on a more restricted basis as other resources allow. Library services provided will become limited to the time staffing resources will allow.

NM The Coalition received a total of over $130,000 over the past three years for the SLRC. No additional state funding has since been allocated to support this program. The approximate 30% increase in training, technical assistance, and related services realized in each of the past three years will be lost, and without other funding to replace the SLRC funds, cutbacks will be made in staffing, training, and materials purchases.

NY The Center is currently operating on "no cost extension" of FY94 SED and DSS Funds. As of 12/30/95 these extensions end, and the NY SLRC will cease to exist. The School of Education-SUNY Albany is seeking foundation funding to develop a resource center. However, should such funding be realized, the Center's relationship with NYSED will have to be determined.

OH We are continuing at 70% level this year with 353 funds and state match in state budget. We anticipate similar funding for another year after this one.

OK Caused reduction of staff (50%). Services are limited by lack of research time and preparation of papers. Funding adequate until 9-30-96. I anticipate that Center will close if funding not forthcoming.

PA Presently the SLRC function is being funded by carryover funds from the previous federal grant(s). The SLRC function in PA is being "scaled back," and other funding to support the functions is being pursued. Under current funding constraints it is expected that the SLRC function will be limited to just publication and dissemination of 353 projects for FY96-97.

SC Our funding has been cut by more than half, but our workload has more than doubled. We are finding ourselves providing training for regular K-12 teachers to justify the SDE picking up the slack in our funding.

SD No additional materials purchased for use by literacy councils. No funds for training are available. The literacy resource center will continue to assist providers with location and access to existing materials as its only responsibility. No state funds will be made available.

TN We have no SLRC funding for this FY, but the Center for Literacy Studies continues with other funding to do some of the same work (but not all). Without federal funding we expect future work of the Center for Literacy Studies to be less state-focussed, providing fewer resources to Tennessee literacy programs.

UT The bulk of our funds are federal; however, we remain very optimistic and are carrying on with same level of funds.

Table P7, cont'd

VT	Vermont received such a small SLRC grant - $18,000 - that the loss of the money was not a crisis. The funding was used to implement the work plan of the Vermont Literacy Board (as outlined earlier). We need to fundraise to support the newsletter and our director is unable to attend staff development events (such as conferences), and our support of the New England Literacy Resource Center was cut.
VA	Massive cuts in this year's budget meant personnel reduction (support staff) and reducing a full-time librarian's job into a part-time position—which will slow down the process of getting the Center's holdings (about 12,000 titles) online and converting records into MARC. Services are affected and certain components of our project (i.e., the field-testing and evaluation of instructional materials by some 25 teachers statewide) have to be deleted from the budget. Production of the Learning Resources Evaluation Manual and the AE Curricula Resource Catalog (an annually produced product) was also deleted from the budget. Travel for staff has been drastically cut (with some professional staff with no travel at all in the budget), thus restricting the training activities we'd aggressively targeted in our plan to a minimum. Also, there's no money for promotional products for the SLRC, and no money for external evaluation and marketing to build awareness. If the SLRC funding is not restored, our SLRC cannot meet the needs of our AE and literacy field. We cannot expand services and be state-of-the-art.
WA	Budget reduced - RLC $ replaced by 4 states, mostly w/353 $. Intent for 7-1-96 to 6-30-97 is to continue to operate as a state center.
WI	The WI Literacy Resource network staffing has been dramatically scaled back. Adult education program planning is conservative,with no planned increase in funded services. Volunteer literacy organizations are becoming more involved in local and state planning and service delivery. The state has adopted a posture which would not replace funds lost by federal cuts. The assistant state director of the WI Technical College System Board is actively involved in interagency planning.
WV	Technically, our center no longer exists. Almost all of our funding went directly to providers for training, materials, and maintenance of an 800 adult education phone line (as well as a statewide newsletter, Networks). All of these services will be drastically cut or they will end without future funding.

is another question mark. In 1990, the organization took a visible interest in adult literacy in preparation for the 1991 White House Conference on Library and Information Services. Working with the Public Library Data Service of the ALA, it gathered information on the nature and extent of adult literacy services in several hundred local public libraries. Armed with this data, it offered resolutions and recommendations at the conference in support of both adult and youth literacy (though the focus then, as now, was on K-12 students).

However, with this statement made, NCLIS moved on to other things. It has done no further data collection on library involvement in literacy (and neither has the ALA's Public Library Data Service). Moreover, in the last four or five years it has undertaken no new literacy initiatives and does not plan to do so in the future, according to a spokesperson there.

It should be noted, of course, that NCLIS' annual budget was reduced by 25% this year—to about $750,000—making it hard for the group to pursue more than a few priorities at a time.

It should also be noted that whatever the ALA's recent role in literacy, the group is about to embark on an exciting and highly promising new leadership initiative, which it helped shape. In a $6.3 million library literacy grant program of the Lila Wallace-Reader's Digest Fund, the ALA has just been funded for three years to give ongoing conference and other technical supports to a group of 13 local libraries which have been awarded demonstration grants to develop and publicize their adult literacy programs as national models.

NATIONAL SLRC TIES

The SLRCs were also asked about *their* national links. A few findings are worth highlighting.

Their strongest connections—to the U.S. Department of Education and the National Institute for Literacy—are to be expected considering that these federal organizations are their primary source of funding and guidance.

But their heavy contact with the University of Pennsylvania's National Center for Adult Literacy is a bit of a surprise considering the constraints under which they operate. They apparently make a serious effort to stay in touch with new research.

P8. What is the SLRC's specific role in statewide planning, policy, and resource development? [SLRC, Q3 only]

Q3 SLRCs (39 responses of 40 possible, 98%)

Participate(d) in planning, policy, and resource development as a member of a council or commission (HI, NC, NH, NM, OH, OK, SC, TN, VT, WV)	10
Coordinate planning and resource development across agencies/ focal point for statewide coordination (IL, LA, AK, MI, MO, MS, MT, PA, VA)	9
Acquire/provide/disseminate materials to the field (CA, IA, IN, MS, ND, SD, VA, WI)	8
Initiate/provide(d) research services/information to inform state planning, policy and resource development (FL, IN, KY, MD, NE, NY, WI)	7
Responsible for/provide staff development/training (CA, LA, MD, ND, SD, WI, WV)	7
Assist State Department of Education, state advisory council, or other statewide body with planning and resource development (AL, CO, MN, NE)	4
Provide technical assistance to local and/or state groups (DE, ND, VA)	3
Conduct needs assessment (UT, WI)	2
Support staff development (IA,NY)	2
Advise governor's office (NE)	1
Promote new adult readers (IA)	1
Operate statewide hotline and referral service (VA)	1
Share resources (CT)	1
Promote/fund pooling of resources and training of trainers (IL)	1
Recommend acquisitions (UT)	1
Provide technical assistance to all state Even Start programs (SC)	1
Develop curricula for ABE/workplace programs (SC)	1
Facilitative role (NJ)	1
Provide access to literacy materials through online catalog (SD)	1
Work with Congressional delegation on public policy work (MI)	1
Policy development (MS)	1
Provide communications link (VA)	1
Virtually none (WA)	1

Their extensive contact with the national Literacy Volunteers of America and Laubach organizations is not surprising, considering that many library literacy programs are actually LVA and Laubach affiliate operations.

But in light of this study's focus, the most provocative finding (in P6a) is the extremely *low* contact that SLRCs have with the ALA and NCLIS. Only 10% of them work with these two groups. Once again, they do not seem to be giving much attention to libraries as agents for the delivery of adult basic skills service.

THE NATIONAL HELP LIBRARIES NEED

Next, in P6b, librarians and library agency literacy contacts were invited to consider what national-level help not now being provided they would like to have (to advance their agency's role in adult literacy). Very few answered the question, but those who did echoed refrains found throughout the study:

More—and more stable— funding! Providing information and materials! Conducting awareness activities! Help with program coordination and collaboration! Planning assistance!

URGENT NEED TO RESCUE SLRCs

All other questions in section 3 (P7-P11) were directed solely to the SLRCs. They look at the finances and financial health of the SLRCs and at the range and type

P8a. ***Please indicate the SLRC's current annual budget.*** [SLRC, Q3 only]

P9. ***If SLRC is not free-standing please give name of organization it is technically part of (e.g. state department of education, state coalition).*** [SLRC, Q3 only]

	P8a — Budget		P9 — Name of parent organization
Alaska	$1,000,000		Nine Star Enterprises, a 501(c)3 literacy org.
Missouri	900,000		
New York	898,278	Terminated 12/31/95	School of Education, SUNY Albany
California	870,000	Plus $80,000 in-kind staff	
Mississippi	389,000		Institutions of Higher Learning
Arizona	327,866		A nonprofit organization
Illinois	327,000	Enough to go to 12/96	Secretary of State Literacy Office, State Library
Ohio	304,000		Kent State University
Virginia	292,362	For FY 95-96	
New Jersey	224,642		NJ Dept of Ed, Employment & Training Comm
Hawaii	187,575	Payroll & supplies	Hawaii State Public Library System
Michigan	180,000		State Department of Education
Alabama	158,269		State Department of Education
Louisiana	153,907		Governor's Office of Lifelong Learning
Washington	131,000	For 7/95-6/96	Funds from Seattle Central Community College
Indiana	130,000		Indiana Literacy Foundation, Inc. as of 7/95; some new State Library administration
Utah	127,556		State Department of Education
New Mexico	120,000		Administered by the NM Coalition for Literacy
Oklahoma	100,262		State Department of Libraries
Wisconsin	92,000		Wisconsin Technical College System Board
Kentucky	90,500		KY Dept for Adult Education & Literacy, Cabinet for Workforce Development
South Carolina	90,000	Was over $200,000	State Department of Education
Kansas	82,000		State Department of Education
West Virginia	76,369	FY94, -0- FY95 except carryover	State Department of Education
Maryland	75,722		State Department of Education
Iowa	74,000		Northeast Iowa Regional Library Sysem
Connecticut	62,000		Adult Training & Development Network, Capitol Region Education Council
Nebraska	38,000		Dept of Voc & Adult Ed, Univ of Nebraska
Montana	37,842		
New Hampshire	35,370	Last budget: Center dissolved	Was part of Nashua Adult Learning Center
Minnesota	35,000		Part of Literacy Training Network, which has own budget
South Dakota	25,000		SD State Library, Department of Education
Delaware	25,000		DE Assn for Adult & Community Education
North Dakota	24,000		State Department of Education
Pennsylvania	0	Using leftover 94-95 $	State Department of Education
Tennessee	0	For 1995-96	University of Tennessee
Vermont	0		VT State Dept of Education, VT Literacy Bd
Colorado		Don't know. It varies.	State Department of Education
North Carolina		N.R.	353 proj. of Training Inst. @ Appalachian St. Univ.
Florida		SLRC closed 7/95, no $	Was part of Florida State University
	$7,684,520		

of services the SLRCs provide to state and local groups.

As even a casual perusal of these tables will show, the SLRCs—at least in their current form—are in great peril. To put the bottom line first, without a substantial and immediate federal initiative to save them and/or some bold new intervention by the states, most SLRCs will either die on the vine or become increasingly barren enterprises. Although there are some extraordinary exceptions (California and Illinois are examples), the majority are already in an arrested state.

P10. Please check any of the following specific services that your SLRC provides to literacy planning, policy development, and funding groups in the state. [SLRC, Q3 only]

Q3 SLRC (40 of 40 responded, 100%)

Lending library resouces	93%
Professional staff development	90
Statewide conferencing	83
Evaluation, pgm dev, other tech assistance	75
Policy development & planning	70
State advocacy	66
Data collection & analysis	65
National advocacy	55
Other	25

P11. Please check any of the following services that the SLRC provides directly to local literacy programs (regardless of their institutional base). [SLRC, Q3 only]

Q3 SLRC (40 of 40 responded, 100%)

Professional staff development	90%
Lending library resources	90
Statewide conferencing	80
Public awareness	78
Curriculum development	75
Program development	73
Evaluation/assessment	68
Data collection & analysis	65
State advocacy	63
Policy development & planning	63
Training tutors or tutor trainers	60
National advocacy	53
Applying research to practice	55
Fundraising/resource develpment	53
Grant funds	45
Other	18

The dismal fact is that there has been no federal funding for SLRCs since their 1995 funding was rescinded. The National Institute for Literacy indicates that the best hope for restoration of funding is the Workforce Development Act now pending in Congress. But even if that Act passes, funds would not necessarily be earmarked for them and there is no certainty that they would get them.

Moreover, if some funding were to spring from that source, it would not be available until July 1997 at the earliest, more likely July 1998.

Even knowing that federal relief might be in the pipeline, how many can hold out another year or two? And, would the amount of future funding provided be adequate to sustain an effective range and level of service? In the few cases where SLRCs are on firmer financial ground, they may have a chance. But, for most, Tables P7 and P8a reveal that as things stand it is only a matter of time.

The best service is always provided closest to home because needs vary substantially from community to community and state to state. Thus, the ideal response would be for the states to step in and save their own SLRCs. This probably is not likely.

The only feasible course, given the stark reality of the situation, may be for the federal government— perhaps in consultation with various stakeholders in the states—to reconceptualize the very structure of the SLRCs, at least those that are endangered. One option might be to transform those in peril into strategically placed regional centers around the country. Indeed, a few SLRCs are already part of such groups.

Moreover, an effort to structurally revamp the resource centers would provide an opportunity to rethink their fundamental role, something that their survival also appears to depend on. It could well be that in trying to do something for everyone—which many sections of this report show to be the case—the SLRCs are carrying too onerous a burden in any case.

In their enabling legislation SLRCs were thought of —like the National Institute for Literacy—as overarching entities that were not primarily educational in nature and organization but that should include education, labor, human resource and development, and other kinds of entities as equal partners.

The basic philosophy was that literacy is not only an educational problem; it cuts across the legitimate interests and programs of many social and economic domains.

But, as Table P9 shows, not many SLRCs have been implemented according to this ideal, and the holder of the purse usually dictates the expenditure and its purpose. Of the 40 taking part in the study, half are controlled by state education departments (i.e. located *within* them). The others are scattered within library systems (5), colleges and universities (8), and other organizations. One (in Louisiana) is under the direct jurisdiction of a governor's office. Only two or three are free-standing entities with independent leadership.

Thus, it is not surprising to learn (in P8 and P9) that, for the most part, the SLRCs do not operate as their states' lead coordinating and planning agencies at all.

This certainly does not mean that they never provide any leadership or that they do not have active voices in important statewide forums. On the contrary, Tables P10 and P11 indicate that they provide a wide range of highly substantive analytic, resource development, and technical assistance services—to other literacy planning and policy groups and to a wide array of local literacy programs. (It is interesting to note the extent to which they are also a source of fundraising help to local programs.)

What is incredible is how *much* they have been doing—despite having been poorly implemented ...or politically beaten back...or financially starved...or sometimes all three.

Nevertheless, what all this comes down to is that, in most cases, loss of the SLRC function would clearly deprive state libraries, library literacy programs, and everyone else (including community-based organizations and voluntary programs) of a vital resource at a time when it is most needed.

One of the main things this study sought to clarify was whether the SLRCs can be counted on as a continuing resource. The answer is unknown. Thoughtful intervention would have to take place quickly. The challenge is not easy, but if enough people in the right positions care enough, it could be met.

Perhaps SLRCs (state or regional) should concentrate on analyzing the policies and procedures of the different departments of their state(s) that have relevance to literacy, informing state legislatures about the impact of policies, and recommending new ways to make the literacy instructional and support systems more efficient and effective. They could become the data collection hubs for their jurisdictions and develop systems for communicating the information to all interested populations. They could advocate for collaboration, working with all appropriate groups, government and private, to identify gaps in services and facilitate planning to meet the changing needs. Unless there were no other resources, they would not provide direct services to providers. (Helen Crouch, LVA)

As another measure of leadership, capacity, and substantive engagement, this section takes up a variety of financial and funding questions. Two main lines of inquiry are the issue of dependency on federal funding and the likely impact of state block grant funding on public library involvement in adult literacy.

STATE LIBRARIES AS A SOURCE OF FUNDING

State library personnel were asked (in F1) if their agencies are now a source of literacy funding to regional and local public libraries in their systems. The responses of the two categories of respondents are in some conflict. Nearly three of every five librarians say no, while three of every five of library literacy people say yes. One can only speculate on how to account for the difference, because both groups would be expected to know the facts.

F1. Does your state library agency currently provide adult literacy funding to the state's central and branch public library facilities? [Q1-Q2]

		Yes	No
Q1	State Librarians (34 responses of 35 possible)	44%	56%
Q2	Library Agency Literacy Contacts (39 of 44)	62	38

F2. If federal funding for library literacy programs were substantially cut, which of the following do you think would occur? [Q1-Q4]

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Most library literacy programs would have to reduce their level of outreach/service.	80%	64%	58%	78%
Most programs would be able to find replacement funding.	6	11	5	13
Many programs would be unable to survive.	57	41	45	24
Most programs would not be significantlly affected.	11	16	3	18
Other Impacts	3	7	0	21

Would lose staff, volunteers
Many would survive only with difficulty
Program would be kept routine, little new
Strong collections will become outdated in 5-6 years
Less national advocacy, reduced state emphasis
More time would have to be spent fundraising

F2a. If federal funding for adult literacy programming in general were cut substantially, which of the following do you think would occur? [Q3 only]

	SLRC
Most programs would have to reduce service/outreach.	95%
Most programs would be able to find replacement funding.	3
Many programs would be unable to survive.	59
Most programs would not be significant affected.	3
Other impacts	10

Reduced emphasis on program quality
Some CBOs would cease to exist or to offer literacy instruction.

The essential finding is that **about half of the state libraries claim to have a funding role**. How substantial this funding role is is another matter. A comparison of the F1 responses with those given earlier in Table R3 of Section 1 provides some further insight.

When asked if the development of library-based adult literacy programs was presently a major mission of their state agency, half of the Q1 and Q2 respondees said yes. So it would seem that **most state libraries that consider adult literacy services to be a major part of their mission also back it up with at least some money**.

Moreover, analysis of raw material in the background data book reveals a very interesting fact. Note that the operative word in the question about role was "major." So "no" answers to that question do not necessarily mean those agencies do not work in literacy at all, or that they do not perceive it to be a legitimate activity. (It only means that adult literacy is a relatively low priority in their scheme of things and thus probably more vulnerable in economically troubled times.)

Deeper analysis of data book material reinforces this point. Respondents from groups Q1 and Q2 said that state libraries in 26 states consider the development of library literacy programs a major part of their mission; only 7 of those states did not appear on the F1 list as sources of literacy funding (ID, LA, MA, NH, NV, RI, and VT). Similarly, 30 state agencies *are* named

F3. Federal support for literacy will likely be provided through state block grants starting in the fall of 1996. How do you think this dramatic shift will affect your agency's capacity to provide leadership in library literacy (e.g. will it affect the level of funding available from your agency, will shared decision making among local libraries and your agency be increased or decreased)? [Q1, Q2]

		% Responding	%N.R.
Q1	State Librarians (33 of 35)	94%	6%
Q2	State Agency Literacy Contacts (37 of 44)	84	16

	# Mentions	
	Q1	Q2
Minimal or limited impact	4	7
Probably none—we have strong literacy support from governor's office	3	
No impact	3	
Services for literacy will increase due to recent reorganization in state		1
Services for literacy may increase somewhat because state library shares decision-making with state board of education		1
Our state role and ability to provide library literacy funding may increase		1
We have statutory state funding for adult and family literacy in public libraries		1
If funds are not earmarked for library literacy, we'll lose substantially	2	2
Loss of support will probably be significant	2	2
Without federal funding, there will be no literacy dollars, no state-level capacity	1	1
Literacy will become a lower priority at state/local levels		4
Depends on funding priorities of state or governor	1	3
Funds will go to the state education agency and libraries will lose out	1	1
If funds go to state education agency, we will lose out/won't be able to complete	1	1
If not earmarked for libraries, schools will get the money. Libraries, CBOs and community colleges will be fighting for the same reduced funds		1
No leadership training could be provided & other core program services would have to be reduced		1
Depends on what state agency/office controls the block grant funding		1
Substantial losses if block grants are earmarked for workforce development	1	
Funding will go to traditional ABE programs, not library literacy programs	1	
More staff time and resources will be needed to compete for the resources	1	1
We will have to reduce or eliminate ongoing program support	1	
It all depends on the level of block grant funding	1	1
We will continue to sponsor literacy workshops for librarians and to help librarians develop grants and take part in joint planning	1	
Shared decision making among local and state libraries will decrease		1
Decision making among locals and state library will increase	1	1
None—we have never been able to use federal literacy funding as it is because of other pressing needs	1	1
We'll continue to do the best we can	1	
Don't know	4	5

F3a. Federal support for literacy will likely be provided through state block grants starting in the fall of 1996. How do you think this dramatic shift will affect the adult literacy situation in your state from the standpoint of funding, policy development and planning, and service provision? [Q3, Q4]

		% Responding	% N.R.
Q3	SLRCs (37 of 40)	93%	7%
Q4	Local Programs (61 of 63)	97	3

	# Mentions	
	Q3	Q4
Will force major reduction of literacy services in the state; there'll be significantly less funding for literacy	5	6
Will eliminate libraries as literacy providers in the state, leave them out in the cold		4
Will eliminate literacy education in the state	1	1
Library groups won't be able to compete with education groups for the funding; we'll be shut out of the funding		7
We'll end up squabbling/competing/scrambling with one another for the state's funding crumbs	1	3
Will not be able to compete for funding without set asides	2	3
Diminished funding for literacy will be further reduced by state program administrative costs, not currently the case with the federal distribution of LSCA		1
Voluntary programs in the state are nearly at a standstill already due to lack of funding and would virtually cease		1
Will be able to compete for funding only if we can become more involved with our state legislators		1
Will be able to access funding only through job and crime prevention programs		1
Will force more collaboration/networking	6	1
Collaboration and communication will be more difficult as we struggle to provide services with less funding		2
Fund distribution may not be made fairly and program favoritism could prevail; state may lack resources to disperse or disperse effectively to local literacy groups	1	3
It all depends on who makes the rules/which agency administers the funds	1	4
It will depend on the governor/governor's office/state politics	5	3
If SDE is in control, there'll be a decrease in services/programs for lowest-skilled individuals, voluntary programs, and the like		5
If SDE is in control there may be new growth opportunities	1	
Policy will be directed by governor's office which will strengthen our position and possibly lead to an increase in funding for adult basic skills services	1	
Will result in service emphasis on more highly-skilled individuals and systems with powerful voices—e.g. ABE, community colleges, schools, job training systems. Voluntary and programs serving lowest skilled individuals will lose out	5	7

in F1, including 12 not included in R3 (AK, AR, CA, CO, CT, MD, MS, NJ, NM, SC, and UT). On balance, then, **a signficant number of state library agencies that do not consider literacy programs a major part of their mission nevertheless provide some funding for literacy activities**.

In other words, although 60% of all 44 state libraries participating in the study say that literacy is a major part of their agencies' mission, significantly more, nearly 70%, apparently provide *some* funding for literacy.

Unfortunately, the next section of this report will show that this funding role does not, with a few extraordinary exceptions, add up to a lot in terms of the actual dollar level of the support.

Moreover, as will be seen later, the federal government has been the source of much of the state library literacy funding —but earmarked federal funds for library literacy have all but disappeared at this writing. This fact has obvious repercussions for the literacy leadership capacity of state libraries, to say nothing of literacy

Table F3a, cont'd

If workforce development remains/becomes a priority in our state, general adult education services will be reduced/further reduced/ defunded	4	8
If emphasis is on getting people off welfare and into work programs that serve lowest-level students will lose funding because they won't be able to meet "hours of participation" funding criteria	1	1
Rural/smaller/innovative programs will lose out to urban programs and more powerful voices—which happened in Indiana when Even Start money shifted from the federal to the state level		3
Stronger agencies/larger programs will survive; those less "evolved" won't		3
SDE emphasis will stay the same, but dollars will be fewer	1	
More adults will turn to libraries and volunteer groups for services		1
May force the state to more clearly define its literacy mission	1	
In this state we'll probably do okay		1
It will be easier to get supplemental funding		1
No impact		1
Don't know or not sure	8	5
We aren't involved in funding, policy development, & planning	1	
No response	1	2

services at the community level.

The Impact Of Federal Cuts

In F2, the vast majority of respondees in all four groups think that **substantial cuts in federal funding for literacy will force most library literacy programs to reduce their level of outreach and service**: 80% of state librarians think so, as do 64% of library agency literacy contacts, 58% of SLRC heads, and 78% of the local programs.

A very high percentage of each group also think that **many programs would be unable to survive**: 57% of state librarians, 41% of library agency literacy contacts, and 45% of SLRCs. Least pessimistic about the prospect of total collapse are the local programs; only one in four of them predict this.

Correspondingly, very few respondees in any of the groups think replacement funding could be found.

[Note that as bad as things could get for public libraries trying to offer literacy services, SLRCs say in F2a that substantial further erosion of federal funding would have even worse consequences for adult literacy generally.]

Unthinkable as this scenario is, analysis of the background data book and of some of the tables in Section 7 of this report indicate that these predictions are not far off.

According to state library agency literacy experts, LSCA Title VI accounts for about 43% of all library literacy funding. LSCA Title I accounts for another 15%, and an additonal 8% comes from other federal sources. Furthermore, the local public library participants themselves say that federal sources (largely LSCA) account for the lion's share of their funding, nearly 40% of it.

The Trouble With Block Grants

Of course, for libraries the big issue is not the disappearance of Title VI of LSCA per se (now scheduled to occur after one last round of grants this fall). It is whether the federal funding that library agencies and library literacy programs have been getting for several years now would still come to them if it is shifted to state block grants.

Thus, questions F3, F3a, and F4 asked the four study groups how, if at all, block grant funding would affect them, their organizations, and adult literacy services in their states.

A few but not many of the respondees believe that a federal shift of funds to state block grants will have little or no impact on them. Overwhelmingly, they are convinced that **if block grant funds are not earmarked for library literacy services, libraries will lose out**.

The reasons are many and varied: In some

F4. Some library literacy personnel are worried that the block grant approach will place libraries at a disadvantage in competing for available state education/literacy funds. What difficulties will you, your organizations, or others involved in the provision of library literacy services face if the majority of literacy funding does come in block grant form? [Q1-Q4]

		% Responding	% N.R.
Q1	State Librarians (32 of 35)	91%	9%
Q2	State Library Literacy Contacts (35 of 44)	80	20
Q3	SLRCs (33 of 40)	83	17
Q4	Local Programs (55 of 63)	87	13

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Depends on what state agency/office controls the funds	1	2	1	1
We/voluntary programs/CBOs already have trouble getting funded because library-based literacy programs are not an SDE/education priority	2	3		1
State library would lose out (or continue to lose out) to state education department/agency	2	3	2	1
Schools will be the priority/and the rest of us will be pitted against each other	1	2		2
If funds go to SDE, we won't get any/or won't be able to compete with ABE	1	1		3
Traditional providers will keep all the money; the whole literacy community is threatened, not just libraries				1
Unless funds are earmarked for state library/library literacy, we won't get any/much of it	1	2	1	9
If funds not given directly to state library, we'll have great trouble getting it	2			
Unless governor/SDE are convinced that libraries have an education role they will do poorly/lose out in the funding competition		2	2	1
Depends on whether the governor has a personal interest/commitment	1	1	1	
If workforce/employment programs are given funding priority it will be at the expense of other programs	1	1	1	4
If adult education is retained as a separate funding track, and doesn't have to compete with vocational education, we should be okay				1
Other education programs, not library programs, will get the funding				1
Library-literacy programs will be given low/lower priority	1	2	1	
Programs that serve lowest-skilled adults (library, voluntary, CBO) will lose out				2
Libraries will have trouble competing with direct service providers	2			
Libraries will have trouble competing because they have no strategic plan			2	
Libraries may/will be pushed out of the funding loop		1	1	1
Very intense competition for the funds with libraries (and voluntary programs, and CBOs) losing	1	1		1
Libraries in many states will not get funded and will lose their incentive to be an integral part of the literacy movement	1			
Staffs will be reduce, in turn increasing administrative and managerial burdens and reducing services			1	4

cases, they think that governors won't care enough. In many cases, they believe that state education agencies will automatically be the fund administrators, and they fear that these agencies won't (many don't now) understand or welcome the library's education role.

[Note: In the essay answers to many of the questions in this study there is an unmistakable undercurrent of mistrust on the part of libraries toward state education departments.]

Many of the respondees are also concerned that workforce training will be emphasized at the expense of other kinds of programs (especially those of voluntary groups, CBOs, and libraries—organiza-

> The endemic fragmentation of adult education efforts is particularly serious for library literacy programs. They rightly have the impression that they may dry up and blow away if federal categorical support (and the state policies it directly or indirectly drives) goes away. Overall, they are caught in a double bind. Support is waning for both the literacy movement and the library movement, but both need to be strengthened if library literacy programs are to survive. (Forrest Chisman, Southport Institute for Policy Analysis)

Table F4 cont'd	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Large fish will gobble up the food/we're so small we'd get creamed	2	2	1	3
In a primarily rural state, urban programs will have trouble competing				1
Six wolves in a pen and only food for 3			1	
There will be decreased funding, more competition and/or less collaboration/ we'll be scrambling or pitted against each other for less money			2	5
We won't have enough clout/resources to compete		2		2
Without better communication among agencies, there will be problems		1	2	
Unless our state library is committed to library literacy we will suffer				2
Our library-literacy program alreadly operates with no funding				1
Libraries don't have much of a role in our state; it'll be easy to decrease their funding			1	
None that we don't have now—we're already underfunded				2
We don't apply for state education/literacy funds now				1
Poor collections for use by adult students will result		1		
Very problematic				2
Don't know/hard to tell/not sure	6	5	4	7
None	4	1	1	
Groups that have established strong partnerships with others in the community should do all right; those that have no partners are less likely to get funded	1			1
Minimal, won't have much affect	2	2	3	4
Won't have much affect on established programs or high-visibility programs	1			1
Service provision will be less fragmented as programs will have to consolidate			1	
Answer not applicable/clear	1	2	6	1

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

tions that serve the lowest-skilled adults). Along the same lines, they fear that schools and traditional ABE programs, both having more organized and powerful voices, will get preferential treatment —pushing things back to where they were before the adult literacy movement came along and leveled the playing field.

In short, there is a powerful sense, which appears to be based on experience, that **how well libraries do on the playing field of the future—indeed whether they are even able to get onto the field —will depend on who controls the funds and whether anything is earmarked for library literacy**.

Of course, the amount of financing is obviously a crucial matter, too. Increasingly, these groups see a situation of diminished funding in which lack of sensitive federal or state leadership will pit them against each other and everyone else.

"Six wolves in a pen and only food for three," observes one respondee. "Large fish will gobble up the food," say others. Or, "rural programs won't be able to compete with

F4a. What can national and state leadership organizations do to help you and other literacy/library groups in your state minimize or protect against anticipated problems from the block grant approach? [Q1-Q4]

		%Responding	% N.R.
Q1	State Librarians (27 of 35)	77%	23%
Q2	State Library Literacy Contacts (31 of 44)	70	30
Q3	SLRCs (33 of 40)	83	17
Q4	Local Programs(56 of 63)	89	11

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
National groups can provide information and statistical data	1	1	1	
Document and provide information about programs and their achievements to legislators	1	1	1	2
Providing timely information about the changes would help		1		
Issue position statements on the use of funds, models of service/ propose standards		2	1	
Develop information pieces for state education agencies, human resource groups, and other state entities which may get block grants to show the value of library-literacy programs. Distribute this through state libraries and ask them to take an active communications role.		1		
Provide every governor with print information on role and importance of library literacy programs. Follow up with personal phone calls		1		
Promote collaboration/coordination/consolidation of activities	3	3	7	5
Provide policy development and planning assistance/be a partner in such activities			3	
Encourage each state to develop a comprehensive statewide development plan which explicitly includes literacy/urge or require each state to allocate a percentage of its funding for literacy and for voluntary/library programs			1	3
Help get the message out that programs serving low-skilled adults (library-literacy programs, CBOs, voluntary programs) and ESL programs provide a vital service not offered in traditional ABE, workforce, or job training programs/show importance of social values as well as economic				12
Publicize the negative national impact if low-level adult readers were suddenly denied library-literacy services (perhaps in a television campaign)				2
Education departments should be required to include nontraditonal and non-classroom-based programs in their thinking and funding		1		1
Help incorporate technology more into service delivery			1	
Make it clear that literacy is a national and state priority			1	1
Help dispel the concept of the "quick fix"			1	
Advocacy and public relations—directed especially to policymakers, governors, legislators	2	1		5
Conduct a maor information blitz to state library directors stressing the importance and cost-effectiveness of library literacy programs				1

urban programs" or vice versa.

Clearly, the groups in the study understand as well as anyone the dangers they face. And some fully appreciate that the adult literacy movement as a whole is on or headed for a backward slide. It could be pushed *way* back into the shadows if the block grant movement goes forward without adequate, earmarked funding provided, and if explicit federal guidelines are not set down for state spending on both adult literacy and library literacy.

How National & State Organizations Can Help

In question F4a, groups Q1-Q4 were asked to think about how national and state-level groups might help them minimize or protect against problems resulting from the state block grant approach. The responses range all over the map. But the majority fall into several broad thematic areas:

There is **a heavy call for national and state leadership organizations**

Table F4a, cont'd

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Awareness activities that educate policymakers on the relationships between adult illiteracy and welfare, unemployment, and crime			1	
Public awareness campaigns to promote/make evident what libraries can/do contribute to adult literacy service provision	1	1		2
Promote literacy at the National Governors' Conference	1	1		
Educate political leaders, funders, the National Governors' Association on the role of public libraries in adult literacy programming		1		2
Assure a process that gives all groups—regardless of size and outreach—an effective voice and equal access to funds			4	6
Mandate truly representative advisory groups and state interagency working groups to plan and coordinate policies			1	
Keep lines of communications open between diverse literacy and adult education providers		1	1	
Have SLRCs seek input/ involvement from all players through workshops				1
State/local organizations can work together to mesh overlapping/ duplicative programs that are by themselves too expensive to run	1	1		2
Help local groups develop planning, fundraising and budgeting, and coalition-building skills	1			
Help state and local libraries develop better marketing strategies	1			
Encourage, develop, demonstrate meaningful sytsems of accountability			2	1
Consultants could travel to the states to give workshops and seminars	1	1		
Convene a national library literacy forum with involvement of the ALA, the US Department of Education, and other national groups		1		
Provide forums for discussion and information				1
Legislation should set aside a specific percentage of adult education funds for literacy/library-literacy programs	3	1	1	
Libraries should be included as potential recipients in set-aside funding for literacy services below GED level		1		
Push for block grants to be awarded for literacy through LSCA/LSTA legislation	1			
Ensure set-asides for library literacy programs			1	8
Make sure that adult education and vocational education funding are kept separate				1
Ensure that a percentage of literacy funding goes directly to the state library agencies/public libraries	2	2		3
Push for percentage of block grants to be earmarked for adult literacy/basic education	1	1	3	3
Insist that adult literacy funds be administered by state education agencies				1

Table F4a, cont'd

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Make sure that local programs are not held to improper/impossible standards and thus cut out of the funding				3
It's a question of politics in our state, which state agencies are in control and the literacy interests/commitment of elected officials	1			
Recognize public libraries as players, in legislation and other ways	1	1		1
Ensure that library leaders have an equal say in planning and funding decisions/encourage state library agencies to participate in administration of block grant funds	1	1		1
Encourage state-level groups to permit local literacy programs to determine their own program orientation based on their assessment of local need, rather than to be forced into, say, a workforce mode getting state emphasis				2
Make sure that block-grant funds are equitably distributed based on need				5
Lobby for adequate/increased funding	1	1	1	1
Require a higher level of support than is the case now			1	
Revise legislation to guarantee longer-term funding				2
Continued lobbying by all individuals and organizations		1		
Professional organizations should do more to bring about funding increases based on demonstrated need			1	
Block/don't implement the block grant movement/ literacy funding should be kept at federal level		1		2
Reduce conflicting provisions in public law			1	
Eliminate expensive bureaucratic requirements				1
Develop a sound plan			1	
It depends on the interest/commitment of the governor			1	
Provide more state funding, less national funding	1			
Keep an open mind—it may be an opportunity			1	1
National groups can't help; it's a state-based problem; it's a matter of our own understanding/commitment; we have to be organized at the local level	1	2	1	1
Don't know/not sure	6	2	2	5
None	2			
Not applicable		1		
Answer unclear			1	

to provide more and better information about adult illiteracy and to undertake awareness activities that promote illiteracy as a continuing national priority.

There are numerous calls for evaluating, documenting, and getting the word out about successful programs. Many respondees feel that the role of public libraries should be more widely publicized. And many, especially local library literacy programs, want help to show that programs serving low-skilled adults (libraries, CBOs, voluntary groups) are performing a unique and vital service.

Among the most important targets for these activities are governors and the National Governors' Association, state and national legislators and other political leaders, state education agencies, and public libraries themselves.

Various kinds of hands-on technical assistance is also called for—with both local and state groups seen as benefitting from it. The leadership sources indicated are SLRCs, national organizations, and nationally-supplied consultants who could

F5. Please give your state's FY95 funding for all adult literacy programs —including workforce, family, ESL, ABE, voluntary—or give the amount for the latest year available and specify the year. [Q3 only]

F5a. Indicate the percentage of state adult literacy funding that goes to library literacy programs. [Q3 only]

F6. As a percentage of the total state budget, in the past 5 years has state funding of adult literacy increased, decreased, or stayed about the same? [Q3 only]

F6a. In dollar amount of support, in the past 5 years has state funding of adult literacy increased, decreased, or stayed about the same? [Q3 only]

	F5 Total Est. State Literacy Funding	Year	F5a Library Literacy $ as % Of F5	State's Adult Literacy Funding In Past 5 Years							
				F6 As % of Total State Budget				F6a In $ Amount Of Support			
				(+)	(-)	Same	D.K.	(+)	(-)	Same	D.K.
AL	4,000,000	FY95	5	1				1			
AK	3,000,000	FY95	?			1				1	
AZ	3,000,000	FY96	N.R.			1				1	
CA	D.K.		D.K.								
CO	D.K.		D.K.			1				1	
CT	23,000,000	FY95	1			1		1			
DE	D.K.		D.K.		1				1		
FL	N.R.		N.R.				N.R.				N.R.
HI	N.R.		N.R.			1				1	
IA	1,759,000	FY95	3			1				1	
IL	25,000,000	FY95	20			1		1			
IN	1,500,000		10		0.5	0.5		1			
KS	1,000,000	FY95	20	1				1			
KY	N.R.		N.R.	1				1			
LA	D.K.		D.K.		1				1		
MD	N.R.		N.R.			1				1	
MI	D.K.		D.K.			1				1	
MN	18,000,000	FY94-95	D.K.		1				1		
MO	N.R.		N.R.	1				1			
MS	8,000,000	FY95-96	D.K.	1				1			
MT	D.K.		D.K.			1					1
NC	29,000,000	FY94	0				1				1
ND	1,500,000	FY94-95	0			1				1	
NE	D.K.		D.K.			1				1	
NH	1,800,000	FY95	0			1				1	
NJ	D.K.		D.K.				1				1
NM	4,570,000	FY95	10		1					1	
NY	D.K.		D.K.	1				1			
OH	N.R.		N.R.				1				1
OK	500,000	FY95	N.R.				N.R.				N.R.
PA	20,102,231	FY95	2			1				1	
SC	N.R.		N.R.	1				1			
SD	800,000	FY95	0			1				1	
TN	N.R.		0	1				1			
UT	7,134,000	FY95/96	0			1		1			
VT	N.R.	FY95-96	N.R.		1				1		
VA	850,000	D.K.			1						N.R.
WA	18,000,000	FY95	1	1				1			
WV	2,013,827	FY95	1	1				1			
WI	N.R.	D.K.				1				1	

Note: The SLRCs in IA and SD indicate that the source of information is their SDE. NE indicates no access to the information but believes there is no state funding. SC said that the state contribution is 3 times the federal. State funding information in this table is relatively useless and probably represents a good deal of guessing. Little can be concluded except that most SLRCs do not appear to have direct access to information about their states' literacy finances and funding.

F7. What % of FY95 literacy funding in the state (or use most recent year) comes from the sources listed below? [Q3]

Key:			
1	Title I of LSCA	8	Non-ABE state sources
2	Title VI of LSCA	9	Municipal
3	ABE State Grant Program	10	Corporate
4	Workplace Literacy Grants, DAEL, USDE	11	Foundation grants
5	Other USDE	12	Individual donations
6	U.S. Dept. of Labor	13	Other (specify)
7	Other federal		

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
AL				x					x					
AK				60			10		10					10
AZ			10	70	10							5	5	
CA	D.K.													
CO	D.K.													
CT				15		5	3		40	37				
DE	N.A.													
FL	N.R.													
HI			27			36								
IA	D.K.													
IL		1	1	25	5				60			8		
IN			30	30	10		5					5		20
KS									100					
KY		1	1	18	1		8	1	46	1	0.5	0.5	2	20
LA	N.R.													
MD	N.R.													
MI				8										
MN		0.5	0.5	15	1		7		55		4	2		15
MO	D.K.													
MS		1												
MT	D.K.													
NC	N.R.													
ND				50			5		30					10
NE	N.R.													
NH			5	70					25					
NJ	N.R.													
NM			10	60		20	2				3	5		
NY	N.R.													
OH	D.K.													
OK	N.R.													
PA				60		5			35					
SC				23		6	0.1	0.7	70					
SD		1		95		3							1	
TN	N.R.													
UT		1	1	24	8	2			64					
VT		1	1	40	17	38								3
VA	D.K.													
WA				20			10	10	60	1	1	1	1	
WV				33			67							
WI	N.R.													

Note: Little can be concluded from this table other than that in the judgment of SLRCs the principal source of funding in states for adult literacy (not library literacy programs!) is federal/state ABE grants. Among the non-ABE state sources specified were General Revenue (IL) and state appropriations generally (KS, ND). Even Start funding was cited in several of the Category 5 responses. JTPA and JOBS were cited in a number of instances. The National Guard provides signficant funding in AK. Contractual arrangements produce some income (14%) in ND. VISTA, the state literacy board (VT), and a statewide foundation (IN) are cited as important current or future sources.

travel the states giving workshops and seminars. The respondents would also like to have help with policy and planning, developing accountability procedures, incorporating technology into service delivery, fundraising, budgeting, coalition-building, marketing, and other areas of perceived need.

Not unexpectedly, there are also strong calls for leadership groups to ensure that block grants include literacy set-asides for libraries, and that processes are protected or adopted to assure equitable distribution of funding.

It isn't hard to see that action on all of these fronts would be helpful to state and local library-literacy groups, and to general literacy groups as well. Indeed, most of them are activities that have been needed all along—and that have been *given* all along, but in varying degree depending on the political and economic winds.

However, while it is a plus that the respondents recognize the form that most practical help can take, more movement on any of these fronts, while desirable, would not produce results overnight. **More urgently needed in the present economic and ideological climate is something new, something with potential for an immediate impact.**

F8. Does the SLRC currently have a major role in directing or facilitating the flow of adult literacy funding to the state's local literacy programs, including those based in libraries? If yes, what form does this role take and with what other key groups is the responsibility shared. [Q3 only]

	Yes	No	Don't Know
SLRCs (40 of 40)	15%	83%	2%

States answering yes: Alaska, Illinois, Michigan, North Dakota, South Carolina, South Dakota

Groups with which shared:
Advisory through ABE Interagency Committee (AK)
Secretary of State's Literacy Office because that office operates the SLRC (IL)
The Library of Michigan Foundation's *Read Indeed* program, which we fund (MI)
We administer several grants; our staff reviews local project proposals and recommends funding (SC)
The State Library, ABE, and SD Literacy Council (SD)

The thinking is thin and lacking in innovation from this standpoint. But there are a few promising ideas. Here are three of the best:

◆ Professional organizations should do more to bring about funding increases based on demonstrated need.

◆ A national library literacy forum should be convened, with involvement of the American Library Association, the U.S. Department of Education, and other national groups.

◆ To show the value of library-literacy programs, information pieces should be developed specifically for state education agencies, human resource groups, and other state entities which may receive block grants. The material should be distributed through state libraries with state libraries asked to take an active communications role.

Uselessness Of SLRC Funding Data

The next five questions in this section (F5, F5a, F6, F6a, F7) were directed solely to the SLRCs. They were designed to shed light on three related matters from the statewide perspective of the SLRCs: the amount of FY95 state funding for adult literacy, the change in level of that funding over the past five years, and the percent of this funding that has gone to library literacy programs. [Note: The issue of state funding for library literacy purposes is taken up again in Section 5.]

Unfortunately, because of the erroneous assumption that SLRCs had been implemented as the widely representative bodies conceived in the National Literacy Act, the survey questions, as it turned out, were somewhat pointless.

With few exceptions, the state funding information in F5-F7 is relatively useless and probably represents a great amount of guessing. Little can be concluded from it other than that the SLRCS are poorly informed about state literacy funding matters and even more so about library literacy funding.

The tables are further evidence, if more be needed, that most SLRCS are out of the loop and function as dependent offices within other organizations.

> One thing that surprised me was how out of the loop SLRCs seemed to be. I think this reflects the fact that they were originally funded as governor's grants, and so ended up going to very different places in each state. (Virginia Heinrich, MN)

However, even if the questions had been directed to state departments of education, it is doubtful that the figures would be completely sound because the SDEs are just one of many state agencies that presumably make expenditures on adult literacy—including human resource, labor, and departments of justice. And no one at the state or national level has ever done a thorough and consistent job of drawing together funding information from such disparate jurisdictions.

Despite the general uselessness of the tables, however, they do raise some intriguing issues. Is it possible, for instance, that adult literacy funding in so many states has stayed the same over the past five years despite continual budget cutting at the state level? Or have most states never really allocated very much to adult literacy? Numerous indicators in this study point to the latter.

Also of interest, it was noted earlier that SLRCs are less aware of libraries as a component of the statewide literacy providing system than they should be. This is shown again in F5a—hardly anyone ventures a guess on the library's share.

Finally, the last question in this section (F8) provides another measure of just how removed from the center of power and authority the SLRCs are. All 40 of the participating SLRCs answered the question, yet only 6 of them (AK, IL, MI, ND, SC, SD) said at the time of questioning that they had a major role in the actual *funding* of local literacy programs.

ONE OVERRIDING CONCERN

In the design of this study, a conscious decision was made to avoid explicit references to the level of funding as a problem. The intent was to let the matter surface naturally as an issue, if indeed it was one.

In fact, strong evidence of a major funding problem began to accumulate at the outset of this report. This discussion of finances and funding only adds further urgency to the matter: The lack of funding—and of stability in funding—is an alarming problem on the verge of becoming a crisis. This issue, more than any other, is of overriding concern.

5: LIBRARY AGENCY PROGRAM DATA

Data collection issues are the primary concern in this strand of the study. To what extent do state library agencies collect data about local public library involvement in adult literacy service provision? Is the data substantial enough to give a meaningful current picture of the nature, degree, and financing of that involvement. Only library agency literacy professionals (Q2) were questioned.

LAPD 1. Does your state library agency collect data on the library-based literacy programs in your state? (If yes, please give your best estimates to questions 2-4. If no, skip to question 5.) [Q2 only]

State Library Literacy Contacts (39 of 44 responded, 89%)

1 % (#) Responding		2 # Giving Some Data	3 # Giving Data In NCES Format
Yes	No		
33% (13)	67% (26)	14	13

1: CA, FL, GA, IL, IN, LA, MA, MO, ND, NH, SD, TX, WA
2: AK, AR, CA, CO, DE, FL, GA, MA, ND, NH, OK, SD, TX, WA
3: All states included in 2, except CO

The section also provides an estimate of the number of public libraries offering adult literacy services.

In retrospect, expectations about the range and depth of information that could be provided were unrealistically high. Questions asked not only for numbers of local programs involved in specific substantive aspects of literacy service provision but also for those numbers according to different population service areas.

In the hope of compiling comparable data, the population groupings specified were basically those used by the National Center for Educational Statistics in tracking and reporting on library activities generally. Respondees were asked to report according to 11 different population services areas, ranging from a population base of a million or more people down to units of 1,000 or less.

A CRYING NEED FOR DATA COLLECTION

Occasionally, earlier sections of this report have delivered very mixed messages and sometimes deeply discouraging news. But there is opportunity in nearly everything discussed and findings are emphasized that might provide a foundation on which to build.

> Your report screams out for better data collection and dissemination, and for getting information on promising practices (and failed approaches) out to the field in a timely way—on a national basis. (Helen Crouch, LVA)

However, the response to question LAPD 1 reveals that a central building block is missing: **the vast majority of state libraries do not collect data on local public library literacy activities**. Library literacy programming and planning is handicapped as a result.

Moreover, not only don't most state libraries collect data, but extensive telephone interviewing found that other likely sources don't collect it either, at least not in any systematic or regular way—not the Public Data Service of the American Library Association, or the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, or the

LAPD 2. How many local public libraries and library branches in your state offered adult literacy serivces ap. 5 years ago and how many do today? If you do not have 1995 figures, please give the latest available and indicate the year.

LAPD 3. Of those libraries offering services in 1995, how many in each population group have the following characteristics?

1 - # with an all-volunteer staff
2 - # with some paid staff
3 - # providing book collections for adult beginning readers
4 - # providing learning materials for students and/or tutors
5 - # providing space for classes and meetings
6 - # providing information and referral services
7 - # providing direct tutor training and/or student instruction using library staff
8 - # using computer technology for literacy program management purposes

LAPD 4. Of those programs that provide direct tutor training and/or instruction using library staff, how many have the following characteristics?

a - # with an ESL component
b - # with a family literacy component (instruction focused on parents)
c - # with a workforce/workplace component
d - # with off-site instruction (e.g. in prisons, worksites, schools)
e - # that collaborate with outside groups for instructional purposes
(e.g. voluntary organizations, community colleges, public agencies)
f - # using computer technology for instruction/training purposes
g - # using television or video technology for instruction/training purposes

---

CALIFORNIA (reported in terms of library jurisdictions)

LAPD 2	5 years ago	In 1995
In areas of over 1,000,000	4	6
In areas of 500,000 to 999,999	7	6
In areas of 250,000 to 499,999	7	8
In areas of 100,000 to 249,999	22	23
In areas of 50,000 to 99,999	18	30
In areas of 25,000 to 49,999	13	18
In areas of 10,000 to 24,999	8	14
In areas of 5,000 to 9,999	1	0
In areas of 2,500 to 4,999	0	0
In areas of 1,000 to 2,499	0	0
In areas of less than 1,000	0	0
Totals	81	105

[Note: Some population areas have increased and thus been recategorized in 1995.]

LAPD 3:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
In areas of over 1,000,000	0	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
In areas of 500,000 to 999,999	0	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
In areas of 250,000 to 499,999	0	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
In areas of 100,000 to 249,999	1	22	23	23	23	23	22	22
In areas of 50,000 to 99,999	3	27	30	30	30	30	27	27
In areas of 25,000 to 49,999	3	15	18	18	18	18	15	15
In areas of 10,000 to 24,999	3	11	14	14	14	14	11	11
In areas of 5,000 to 9,999	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
In areas of 2,500 to 4,999	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
In areas of 1,000 to 2,499	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
In areas of less than 1,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

National Center for Education Statistics, or any number of other national or state-level groups one might consider.

In fact, the last time anything resembling comprehensive, system-wide data was collected was in the 1990 effort of the Public Library Data Service to inform the 1991 White House Conference on Libraries and Information Science. But that data reflected only what 583 Data Service members volunteered to report about the kinds of literacy activities they were engaged in.

USING OLD DATA TO DERIVE CURRENT NUMBERS

The best that can be done to estimate current numbers is to fall back on a study contracted more than a decade ago by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI) of the U.S. Department of Education.

That study was conducted by a team of researchers from the University of Wisconsin—Douglas Zweizig, Jane Robbins, and Debra Wilcox Johnson. As one component of a larger study, the group surveyed a national sampling of public libraries to determine, among other things, how many were involved in adult literacy and the extent of that involvement judged by the number and type of literacy activities in which they were engaged.

Their May 1988 report—*Libraries and Literacy Education: Comprehensive Survey Report*—indicated that of the 8,561 public libraries then in existence, some 19% were "moderately" involved, while 4% were found to have a high level of involvement.

This translates into some 1,969 public libraries (23%) then involved substantially in adult literacy service provision. In other words, about one-quarter of all public libraries had a *major* adult literacy involvement eight to ten years ago.

Moreover, another 64% were "minimally" involved in adult literacy (only 13% were not involved at all), translating into an additional 5,479 libraries having *some* involvement.

The number of public libraries in existence has grown since 1988. According to the National

Tables LAPD 2-4, cont'd

California, cont'd

LAPD 4:	a	b	c	d	e	f	g
In areas of over 1,000,000	1	5	1	6	6	3	4
In areas of 500,000 to 999,999	1	5	1	6	6	0	1
In areas of 250,000 to 499,999	1	5	3	8	8	2	3
In areas of 100,000 to 249,999	6	10	6	22	22	8	7
In areas of 50,000 to 99,999	5	11	6	27	27	8	8
In areas of 25,000 to 49,999	5	11	3	15	15	2	5
In areas of 10,000 to 24,999	3	11	4	9	9	0	3
In areas of 5,000 to 9,999	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
In areas of 2,500 to 4,999	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
In areas of 1,000 to 2,499	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
In areas of less than 1,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

FLORIDA

LAPD 2:	5 years ago	In 1995
In areas of over 1,000,000	65	65
In areas of 500,000 to 999,999	80	84
In areas of 250,000 to 499,999	69	69
In areas of 100,000 to 249,999	91	90
In areas of 50,000 to 99,999	41	42
In areas of 25,000 to 49,999	26	28
In areas of 10,000 to 24,999	19	19
In areas of 5,000 to 9,999	10	10
In areas of 2,500 to 4,999	4	4
In areas of 1,000 to 2,499	0	0
In areas of less than 1,000	0	0
Totals	405	411

LAPD 3:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
In areas of over 1,000,000	0	65	65	65	65	65	65	65
In areas of 500,000 to 999,999	0	84	84	84	84	84	31	70*
In areas of 250,000 to 499,999	0	69	69	69	69	69	20*	60*
In areas of 100,000 to 249,999	0	90	90	90	90	90	20*	79*
In areas of 50,000 to 99,999	0	22	42	42	42	42	10*	15*
In areas of 25,000 to 49,999	5*	16	28	28	28	28	8*	12*
In areas of 10,000 to 24,999	10*	9	19	19	19	19	5*	8*
In areas of 5,000 to 9,999	8*	2	10	8	10	10	2*	2*
In areas of 2,500 to 4,999								
In areas of 1,000 to 2,499								
In areas of less than 1,000								

* approximate

LAPD 4:	a	b	c	d	e	f	g
In areas of over 1,000,000	65	35	65	30*	65	15*	0
In areas of 500,000 to 999,999							
In areas of 250,000 to 499,999							
In areas of 100,000 to 249,999							
In areas of 50,000 to 99,999							
In areas of 25,000 to 49,999							
In areas of 10,000 to 24,999							
In areas of 5,000 to 9,999							
In areas of 2,500 to 4,999							
In areas of 1,000 to 2,499							
In areas of less than 1,000							

* approximate

[Note: We do not collect specific data to be able to respond accurately to this question. Level of service is far greater than guess-timates would indicate.]

Tables LAPD 2-4, cont'd

NEW HAMPSHIRE

LAPD 2		5 years ago	In 1995
In areas of over 1,000,000	n.a.		
In areas of 500,000 to 999,999	n.a		
In areas of 250,000 to 499,999	n.a		
In areas of 100,000 to 249,999	n.a.		
In areas of 50,000 to 99,999		0	1
In areas of 25,000 to 49,999		1	3
In areas of 10,000 to 24,999		2	7
In areas of 5,000 to 9,999		2	7
In areas of 2,500 to 4,999		1	10
In areas of 1,000 to 2,499		2	5
In areas of less than 1,000		0	1
Totals		8	33

LAPD 3:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
In areas of over 1,000,000	n.a.							
In areas of 500,000 to 999,999								
In areas of 250,000 to 499,999	n.a.							
In areas of 100,000 to 249,999	n.a.							
In areas of 50,000 to 99,999		1	1	1	1	1		
In areas of 25,000 to 49,999	2	1	3	3	3	3	1	1
In areas of 10,000 to 24,999	8	0	8	8	8	8	0	0
In areas of 5,000 to 9,999	6	1	7	7	7	7	1	1
In areas of 2,500 to 4,999	8	2	10	10	10	10	2	2
In areas of 1,000 to 2,499	4	1	5	5	5	5	0	1
In areas of less than 1,000	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0

LAPD 4:	a	b	c	d	e	f	g
In areas of over 1,000,000	n.a.						
In areas of 500,000 to 999,999	n.a.						
In areas of 250,000 to 499,999	n.a.						
In areas of 100,000 to 249,999	n.a.						
In areas of 50,000 to 99,999	1	0	0	0	1	0	1
In areas of 25,000 to 49,999	1	0	0	0	1	1	1
In areas of 10,000 to 24,999	n.a.						
In areas of 5,000 to 9,999	1	0	0	0	1	1	1
In areas of 2,500 to 4,999	2	1	0	0	2	2	2
In areas of 1,000 to 2,499	n.a.						
In areas of less than 1,000	0	1	0	0	1	0	0

SOUTH DAKOTA

LAPD 2:	5 years ago	In 1995
In areas of over 1,000,000	n.a.	n.a.
In areas of 500,000 to 999,999	n.a.	n.a.
In areas of 250,000 to 499,999	n.a.	n.a.
In areas of 100,000 to 249,999	n.a.	n.a.
In areas of 50,000 to 99,999	2	2
In areas of 25,000 to 49,999	2	2
In areas of 10,000 to 24,999	6	6
In areas of 5,000 to 9,999	4	4
In areas of 2,500 to 4,999	1	1
In areas of 1,000 to 2,499	1	1
In areas of less than 1,000	0	0
Totals	16	16

Center for Educational Statistics, there were 8,929 local public libraries in 1993—the latest year for which figures are available. They were spread throughout the 50 states and the District of Columbia. The ALA indicates that this number has not changed appreciably since 1993. Thus, the 1988 percentages applied now would mean that today some 2,054 public libraries have a major involvement in providing adult literacy services—assuming, of course, that the definiton of "major " is about the same. Similarly, the number of public libraries having a low level of involvement, *but still some*, would be around 5,700.

In other words, public libraries are hardly a trivial part of the country's adult literacy delivery system.

Obviously, the above estimates are based on a number of hypotheticals. But the order of magnitude suggested is probably reasonable. In fact, findings elsewhere in this study suggest that, if anything, the percentages of moderate to high involvement actually grew during much of the last decade (and began to decrease only recently).

NO DATA ON BRANCH LIBRARIES

Note that the activities of branch sites were not even included in the 1988 study and are thus not included here. But it is highly significant that more than 1,400 public libraries have branch operations, adding more than 7,000 community service venues. And it is common knowledge that many branches across the country are providing adult literacy services, some very extensively.

For instance, the New York Public Library is a single library system that actually serves the three huge boroughs of Manhattan, the Bronx, and Staten Island. Its one adult literacy program—the Centers for Reading and Writing—is really eight different operations based in branch libraries scattered among the three boroughs. (Brooklyn and Queens are served by their own library systems.)

Each branch literacy site has its own staff and site director, its own book and materials collection, a computer center, its own pool of tutors, and other features. The makeup of the staff, tutors, and adult student body differs

Tables LAPD 2-4, cont'd

South Dakota, cont'd

LAPD 3:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
In areas of over 1,000,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
In areas of 500,000-999,999	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
In areas of 250,000 to 499,999	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
In areas of 100,000 to 249,999	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
In areas of 50,000 to 99,999	2	0	2	2	2	2	0	0
In areas of 25,000 to 49,999	2	0	2	2	1	2	0	0
In areas of 10,000 to 24,999	6	0	6	6	4	6	0	0
In areas of 5,000 to 9,999	4	0	4	4	4	4	0	0
In areas of 2,500 to 4,999	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0
In areas of 1,000 to 2,499	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0
In areas of less than 1,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

TEXAS

LAPD 2:	1990	In 1994
In areas of 1,000,000 or more	1	4
In areas of 500,000-999,999	3	1
In areas of 250,000 to 499,999	3	3
In areas of 100,000 to 249,999	13	16
In areas of 50,000 to 99,999	12	12
In areas of 25,000 to 49,999	32	27
In areas of 10,000 to 24,999	45	45
In areas of 5,000 to 9,999	44	37
In areas of 2,500 to 4,999	25	15
In areas of 1,000 to 2,499	11	2
In areas of less than 1,000	2	1
Totals	191	163

LAPD 3 (1994):	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
In areas of over 1,000,000	0	4	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	4	n.a.
In areas of 500,000-999,999	0	1					1	
In areas of 250,000 to 499,999	0	4					3	
In areas of 100,000 to 249,999	0	20					16	
In areas of 50,000 to 99,999	0	24					12	
In areas of 25,000 to 49,999	0	46					27	
In areas of 10,000 to 24,999	2	101					45	
In areas of 5,000 to 9,999	2	108					37	
In areas of 2,500 to 4,999	3	104					15	
In areas of 1,000 to 2,499	4	63					2	
In areas of less than 1,000	1	13					1	

LAPD 4:	a	b	c	d	e	f	g
In areas of over 1,000,000	4	2	0	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
In areas of 500,000-999,999	1	1	1				
In areas of 250,000 to 499,999	1	2	1				
In areas of 100,000 to 249,999	7	4	2				
In areas of 50,000 to 99,999	6	2	2				
In areas of 25,000 to 49,999	15	6	2				
In areas of 10,000 to 24,999	21	5	5				
In areas of 5,000 to 9,999	12	2	2				
In areas of 2,500 to 4,999	20	9	3				
In areas of 1,000 to 2,499	7	4	4				
In areas of less than 1,000	0	1	0				

LAPD 5. *What is the total amount of the State Library's FY95 funding for library literacy programs?* [Q2 only]

Q2	State Library Literacy Contacts	39 of 44 responded, 89%
Illinois	6,000,000	Agency is entire Secretary of State Literacy Office
California	3,466,000	FY year ended 6/96
New York	385,000	$185,000 state grant; ap. $200,000 LSCA
Texas	359,874	10 library systems disburse, ESL included
Indiana	341,831	
Kansas	277,000	
Hawaii	187,575	
Oklahoma	152,781	Plus SLRC @ ap. $100,000
New Jersey	100,000	
New Mexico	70,000	From NM Coalition for Literacy budget of $350,000
Tennessee	64,154	
Montana	61,000	$35,000 LSCA Title VI; $26,000 SLRC
Massachusetts	60,000	Do not provide direct funding apart from LSCA
Kentucky	39,130	
Arkansas	35,000	LSCA Title VI
Oregon	34,992	FY94 LSCA Title VI
Florida	25,000	
Missouri	18,257	
Michigan	17,381	
South Dakota	15,000	
Mississippi	10,116	
Ohio	5,400	Down from $55,000 in 1991 and $116,000 high in 1989
Delaware	4,147	
Pennsylvania	0	
West Virginia	0	
Virginia	0	
Vermont	0	
South Carolina	0	
New Hampshire	0	
Wyoming	0	
Louisiana	0	
Idaho	0	
Georgia	0	LSCA Title I funds only
Iowa	0	
North Dakota	0	
Nebraska	0	
Maine	0	
Alaska	0	
Colorado	?	Minimal. All federal grants

significantly from site to site depending on the economic and social make-up of the community in which the branch is located. And program problems and strengths differ because of variations in specific branch environment.

Administrative support, evaluation standards, funding, and other system-wide supports are provided from a ninth branch location under the direction of an overall program head who reports back to senior library administrative personnel.

As this example shows, it would be highly instructive to know about the literacy activities of the branch libraries, even though many would probably not exist in the absence of administrative support and direction from the main facilities.

MOST STATE LIBRARIES LACK DATA TO LEAD

Returning to the original issue, the LAPD 1 table shows that only 13 of the 39 state libraries responding said that they collect library literacy data. This means that the vast majority of state library agencies in the country are not sufficiently armed with hard data to be able to work effectively with their local libraries on adult literacy programming—or to advocate convincingly in crucial state and national political and policy forums. It is difficult to see how the role of public libraries in adult literacy can be developed in earnest while this glaring data problem goes unattended.

Furthermore, analysis of material in the background data book shows that information provided by three of the respondents was so incomplete and superficial as to be of only marginal use. In fact, only nine of the library agencies responding with data collect really useful data—CA, FL, GA, MA, ND, NH, OK, SD, and TX—and even here, a few of the respondents said they had to make educated guesses or work very hard to adapt their data to the NCES format.

[Note: The Illinois State Library does an exemplary data collection job, but such extensive work would have been required to fit their data into NCES categories that it was mutually decided to proceed without it in the face of project deadlines

LAPD 6. In the past 5 years has the State Library's adult literacy funding increased, decreased, or stayed about the same? [Q2 only]

As % of Total Library Budget			In Dollar Amount Of Support		
Increase	Decrease	Same	Increase	Decrease	Same
5%	41%	54%	6%	36%	58%

(+) MO, OR

(-) AR, CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IN, KS, MD, ME, MI, ND, NE, SC, VA

(Same) AK, CA, DE, IL, KY, LA, MA, MS, NH, NJ, NM, NY, OK, PA, SD, TN, TX, VT, WA, WV

(+) IL, OR

(-) CO, FL, GA, IA, ID, IN, KS, ME, MI, ND, OH, SC, VA

(Same) AK, AR, CA, DE, KY, LA, MA, MO, MS, NH, NJ, NM, NY, OK, PA, SC, SD, TN, TX, VT, WA, WV

LAPD 7. If the State Library agency provides adult literacy funding to the central and branch libraries, what criteria are used to decide on the relative allocations? [Q2 only]

AR	LSCA Title I - criteria for literacy subgrants for public libraries is the same as for any other LSCA Title I subgrant. LSCA Title VI - criteria for participation - (1) illiteracy rate, (2) geographic location in state, and (3) library cooperation with other established area literacy providers.
CA	Our funding is to the local library jurisdictions. They decide which branches to include.
CO	For LSCA , there is an RFP process. Although I have no say in final decision, I do [make recommendations].
DE	Grant process.
FL	We have never turned down a library's request for LSCA grant funds unless that library's request exceeded the 4-year limit that we currently use to fund any one project or unless the proposal was absolutely unsalvageable. We primarily look at the percentage of the total adult population that has not completed high school; number of adults who do not speak English well or at all; method of service delivery; education/training experience of project staff; costs of services proposed by specific budget category; quality of objectives and activities; evaluation plan; etc.
GA	It depends on the number of libraries submitting applications and the grant program area in which they apply.
IL	Our literacy funds are allocated on a community basis. If the library is the best agency to coordinate literacy efforts within a community or neighborhood they become the fiscal agent. They are involved as required partners in all projects. The Literacy Advisory Board has also determined that we should put large resources into communities whose residents are disproportionately represented in the two lower literacy levels—the Hispanic and African American populations.
IN	Program applications judged on merit.
KS	The need, program objectives, methods, evaluation, and future funding capabilities.

Table LAPD 7, cont'd

KY	One statewide program administers competitive subgrants.
MA	A competitive grant round is run every year in all LSCA projects which include literacy & ESL. This changes based on community need, interest, and ability to write and carryout a proposal. This is SEED money to begin new services; it cannot be used for ongoing expenses.
MI	LSCA competitive grant program.
MO	We have an LSCA competitive grants committee that makes the decisions on allocations of all LSCA funds.
MS	Is there a need? Will the dollars make a difference? Will impact justify the project? How will output be measured?
NJ	There are 3 programs: Literacy Instruction, Literacy Collection Development, and Family Literacy. Libraries can submit applications for any or all programs simultaneously. The money is distributed by rank scoring, regardless of program.
NM	The quality of their proposed projects in the universe of literacy program applicants (# of individuals likely to be assisted, use of volunteers, etc.).
NY	Awards based solely on grant applications.
OH	Monies are available through LSCA. We use a NOTICE OF INTENT process which allows the applicant to request what they need. In this next year we only have one library applying.
OK	They apply through a competitive grant process similar to the LSCA Title VI grant application (but easier). The highest scoring applications are funded.
OR	No allocation program. LSCA Title I compeitive grants have evaluation criteria that must be highly scored.
PA	Dependent on applications submitted under a competitive grant process.
SC	Grant application.
SD	Financial need - "mini grant" requests.
TN	Competitive proposals for use of funds.
TX	The library systems determine the allocation of literacy funds to the member libraries based on plans of service.
WA	Funds are distributed purely on the quality of grant proposals submitted to the State Library. Any public library in the state can apply with any literacy idea.

and the meager overall response already evident at the time.]

Finally, although it is an issue of secondary importance, it is interesting to note that there is a weak correspondence between state libraries that accept adult literacy as a major part of their mission, those that provide some funding for literacy, and those that collect useful data for planning and information purposes.

For example, only 6 of the 18 state libraries reported by Q2 respondees to have adult literacy as a major mission collect data on library literacy programs. They report 24 as providing some funding for literacy, but only 10 collect data. Similarly, there is not a 1:1 correspondence in Table LAPD 1 between state libraries that say they collect data and state libraries that actually provided it to the project.

BUT SOME STATES ARE GOOD MODELS

Because so few state libraries collect information on local library literacy programming, the data that was provided is of limited use for making national generalizations.

However, five of the better data sets (CA, FL, NH, SD, TX) are included here in LAPD 2 - LAPD 4 to illustrate that the kind of information the survey tried to collect would be an extraordinarily powerful planning and communications tool—*if* it existed on a widespread basis or could be created.

Moreover, in some respects the information they contain is highly suggestive. For example, it is clear that in some states adult literacy service levels have increased dramatically. This is valuable to know, despite the fact that other data, especially in LAPD 5-6, indicates that on an overall national basis public library literacy service has probably *decreased* in the last two to three years.

The salient point is that experience differs markedly from state to state. To be sure, the lack of regular national data collection is a serious problem, but at the same time it is important to keep in mind that some state libraries are doing an excellent job of it and are very strong models from which other states can learn.

LAPD 8. As best you can determine, what percentage of the state's 1995 funding for library literacy programs comes from the sources listed? [Q2 only]

LSCA Title VI	43%
State sources	16
LSCA Title I	15
Other federal sources	8
Municipal sources	8
Foundation grants	4
Individual donations	3
Corporate grants	1
Other	3

These bright spots of library literacy programming and leadership need to be spotlighted at every opportunity and not buried in national averaging exercises.

PUBLIC LIBRARY INVOLVEMENT IS VARIED IN NATURE

The five data sets of LAPD 2-4 are also suggestive where the *nature* of current library involvement in adult literacy is concerned:

For the most part, local library literacy programs in the states shown are *known by the state agencies* to be involved in all forms of literacy service provision—from building and maintaining book and materials collections for tutors and adult new readers to providing space for classes and meetings of outside groups...to providing information and referral services...to providing direct tutor training and student instructional services.

There is a heavy reliance on paid staff—volunteer tutors are nearly cost-free, but regular paid staff are needed for program administration, training, evaluation, and other program purposes.

In the larger states, direct instructional services are provided by a surprisingly high percentage of the local libraries. ESL services, family literacy, and workplace/ workforce literacy are the focus of much of that instruction. Moreover, the literacy programs have a great deal of outreach, often taking instruction off-site to prisons, worksites, or schools.

Similarly, there is heavy use of computers for both program management and instructional purposes.

These patterns of involvement are state-specific, of course, but it so happens that they fit what local library literacy programs report about their own activities in Section 6. Furthermore, many of the activity involvements are quite consistent with those reported years ago in the OERI study. It would be interesting to know if patterns of involvement have shifted in emphasis over the years, but that is a subject for another study.

STATE AGENCY FUNDING FOR LOCAL LITERACY PROGRAMS IS SCANT

The remainder of this section has to do primarily with matters of library literacy funding.

State library literacy personnel were asked in LAPD 5 to indicate the total amount of their agency's FY95 funding for library literacy programs. As the table shows, the response is notably unremarkable.

Of the 39 agencies answering the question, only two state libraries (5%) provide truly substantial funding—Illinois and California—and both are states in which the libraries have a central leadership role and plenty of political support. Another seven agencies (20%) report six-figure funding levels.

But, on the basis of the evidence supplied, the vast majority of state libraries do not, at present, provide much funding at all. Only 4 (10%) have five-figure grant budgets above $50,000, 10 (26%) report even lower sums, and 16 (41%) provide nothing at all.

Is this poor showing a recent phenomenon—a side effect of shrinking state library budgets generally —or has it been the pattern all along?

Again, with only two or three exceptions, a comparison of LAPD 5 and LAPD 6 responses indicates that about 40% of the agencies have recently experienced significant reductions. Indiana and Kansas are among these, although Ohio's drop from $116,000 in 1989 to $5,400 in 1995 (a 95% loss!) is the most chilling. In most cases, however, it looks as if state libraries now doing little or nothing never really did much.

Of course, a related and perhaps even more important issue is whether the funding that is being given has been coming from core library agency budgets—thus being relatively secure—or whether it is soft and transient in nature.

Tables LAPD 5 and LAPD 7-8 point once again to a dominant federal LSCA role. **These federal programs have been a major source of library literacy funding, Title VI alone accounting for some 43% of it in the estimation of the respondees.** [Note: OERI data indicate that of the 2,249 LSCA Title VI grants awarded between FY86-FY95—amounting to $57 million over the ten-year period—only 155 (6%) went directly to state libraries.]

LAPD 9. Please check any of the following services that your state library agency or the state's central/regional libraries provide for the benefit of local library literacy programs. [Q2 only]

	State Library Agency	Central/ Regional Library
State advocacy	81%	36%
National advocacy	53	22
Policy development & planning	50	22
Statewide or regional conferencing	53	19
Professional staff development	53	17
Evaluation, program development, or other technical assistance	53	17
Data collection & analysis	33	14
Other	25	0

Thus, much of what state library agencies have been doing in adult literacy—to say nothing of local library literacy programs themselves—is in grave danger of evaporating as a result of recent and expected federal cuts and/or unearmarked block grants. Very little appears to have been institutionalized.

STATE LIBRARIES GIVE PLENTY OF OTHER NEEDED HELP

Finally, it is essential to recognize that just because a state library is not directly providing significant or any direct funding to local public library literacy programs does not mean it provides no other important services to them, or that it is not involved in meaningful statewide planning and resource development.

Indeed, LAPD 9 shows that state library literacy personnel think their agencies play quite an important state and national advocacy role.

They also provide policy development and planning services, conferences, and other technical assistance—all activities of benefit to local programs, and **all of which cost the state libraries substantial amounts of money.**

Moreover, there is no direct relationship between what a state library grants to local public library literacy programs, the overall operating revenue of those local programs, or how extensive a state's network of library literacy services and programs is.

State library agencies in Massachusetts and Florida, for example, provide next to no literacy funding, but those states have among the most extensive systems of statewide library literacy service in the nation.

And library agencies and personnel in those states are deeply involved in state planning, data collection, and the like. They also tend to be connected to national planning and development activities and to be recognized leaders in national circles.

6: Local Programs : The Heart Of The Matter

A key purpose of this study was to explore the current and potential leadership roles of state library agencies as a force for strengthening and developing the environment in which local library literacy programs function.

But the local adult literacy programs themselves are at the heart of the entire study—their service...their basic structures and philosophical orientation...the population groups they reach and the numbers of adults they serve...their operating circumstances... the problems and barriers they face in an increasingly unsupportive and hostile world...and the strengths and difficulties they experience, if any, specifically *because* they operate within a library culture. This section of the report looks at these issues.

The programs that took part in the study are not, in a statistical sense, representative of public library literacy programs because the sample (63) is too small for drawing valid national conclusions. But because of the criteria by which they were chosen for participation—nominated or selected based on longevity and an established and recognized track record—information about their programs and problems is especially instructive. It is also consistent with other findings in this study and jibes with what is known about trends in adult literacy generally.

The returns give a useful reading of what is going on among some of the best library literacy programs in the country and some of the most stable. Moreover, if *these* programs have certain problems in common, it can be assumed that other programs have or face many of the same ones, perhaps to an even greater degree.

Purposes & Goals

Table LP1 shows the stated purposes and goals of the participating programs. Collectively the capsule statements attest to great diversity, yet certain shared characteristics stand out.

LP1. Please describe briefly your program's overall purposes and goals. (Note: Number of years in operation is indicated in parentheses at the end of each description.)

AL LVA Anniston /Calhoun County, Anniston Calhoun County Public Library: We provide one-on-one tutoring to adults in Calhoun County over 19 years old. Free lessons in reading and writing and free materials, free training to literacy tutors but ask that they volunteer 50 hours back into the program. (10)

AR Literacy Council of Hot Spring County, Hot Spring County Library: Reading education and literacy (REAL) recruits and train tutors for the adult literacy program and for peer tutoring in county school districts. The goal of REAL is to reduce the rate of illiteracy in adults and children by offering volunteer services of tutoring one-on-one. Cooperation between agencies and organizations is nurtured. Volunteerism of people and organizations is promoted. Library materials, consumable and collection, are purchased. Information is disseminated. (6)

Arkansas River Valley Libraries for Literacy - Reading Together, Arkansas River Valley Regional Library: To assist each person enrolled in the program to reach his/her fullest potential toward becoming a self-sufficient person in terms of decision making, securing employment, providing stable family settings and making worthwhile contributions to the community. (23)

CA Adult Literacy Program - Project Upgrade, Napa City County Library: Provide ESL instruction using volunteer tutors, provide materials collections for basic literacy and ESL, provide reference and referral services, advocate and promote community awareness, offer self-education opportunity through audio/ videotapes and computers. (12)

Adult Literacy Program, Alameda County Library, Fremont: Provide learner-centered reading and writing help to English-speaking adults and families through library programs. We provide one-to-one and small group tutoring, tutor training, materials, computer-assisted instruction, family workshops, and pre-reading activities for young children. We have programs in eight libraries of the County and also work with incarcerated adults in the Alameda County jail system. (11)

Partners in Reading, San Jose Public Library: Partners in Reading enables English-speaking adults to improve their basic literacy skills so they may function more effectively on the job and in society, achieve their goals, and develop their knowledge and potential. Through learner/tutor partnerships, our program uses a variety of methods designed to meet individual learning

Table LP1, cont'd

needs. As a library literacy program, Partners in Reading helps learners acquire skills that enable them to use the services of public libraries more effectively. (6)

Commerce Public Library Adult Literacy Program: Our adult literacy program serves adults aged 16 and over who wish to improve their basic reading, writing, and math skills. Trained volunteers tutor adults in one-to-one or small group settings. Our goal is to help at least 60 students a year move toward their various goals. (12)

LVA Marin County, San Rafael Public Library: Provide reading, writing, and communication skills for adult students to enable them to achieve their goals on the job and in society. Maintain a literacy curriculum based on learner-centered goals. Train and support volunteer tutors. Match tutors and learners one-on-one or small groups. Empower parents to become a child's first teacher. Provide materials for diverse literacy needs. Develop cross-cultural awareness that creates a sense of community. (10)

CO Adult Reading Program, Mesa County Public Library District: The Program provides free, confidential, individualized reading and writing instruction for adults 16 years of age or older, not enrolled in a regular school program and reading below the 6th grade level. Trained volunteer tutors from the county meet at 35 public places with private meeting space at various times of the day or evening to meet the student's schedule. (10)

CT LVA-Greater Waterbury, Silas Bronson Library: Provide family literacy programs to caregivers of young children. Provide basic literacy and ESL training to adults. (21)

DE Project READS, Sussex County Literacy Council, Sussex County Departmentof Libraries: Project READS' goal is to help reduce and eventually eliminate adult illiteracy among residents of Sussex County. Its goal is to help increase literacy skills of Sussex County residents by providing basic reading skills training. (6)

LVA-Wilmington Library: LVA/WLA provides free one-to-one tutoring for adults in basic reading and conversational English skills. The student/tutor teams meet twice a week at a time and place convenient for both. A computer lab, Adult Literacy Learning Center, and family literacy services are also provided. (13)

FL Project LEAD, Miami-Dade Public Library System. Project LEAD has a mission to reach adult learners who speak English, but read below a 3rd-grade level, and bring them up to 5th-grade reading level. At that time, they are referred to the County Adult Education classes to go on and get their GED. (10)

Table LP1, cont'd

Panhandle Library Literacy Consortium, Jefferson County Public Library: Our program is half family literacy in-house and half outreach to find one-to-one tutors and students. (8)

Tampa-Hillsborough County Library System: Provides one-to-one tutoring in basic literacy and ESL.(10)

Literacy Program, Brevard County Library: Our goal is to assist any resident of our county in reaching his/her personal educational goals. (10)

Lifelong Learning Services, Broward County Public Library: Serving the needs of individuals and families in our community by creating, promoting and implementing environments and tools which support the lifelong learning goals of our patrons, including access to our print and databased materials. These book-based learning services, materials,and tools will be consistent with library traditions of free and open access, self empowerment, and learner control. Trainings to duplicate library learning services are provided to libraries, community agencies, grass roots organizations and volunteers. (15)

Center for Adult Learning, Jacksonville Public Libraries: The goal of the Center for Adult Learning (CAL) is to provide functionally illiterate adults the opportunity and resources with which to "function successfully on the job and in society, achieve [their] individual goals and develop [their] knowledge and potential." We also provide a bridge between one-to-one tutoring programs and the GED classroom. Using computer-assisted instruction enhances the learning process and increases the self-confidence of the students. We also provide a New Reader Collection in the Main Library and all branch libraries in the system. (10.5)

GA Learning Center, Athens-Clarke County Public Library. Our program is geared to promote lifelong learning. We firmly believe that if we equip adult new learners with the skills necessary to participate in society, whether it be on a social or economic level, then this will ultimately lead to the eradication of illiteracy. As adults become more literate they will pass on their love of education to their offspring who in turn will strive to make positive impacts on society. We strive to instill "all adults successful" and provide the tools necessary to make that come to pass. (8)

Literacy Program, DeKalb County Public Library: To increase the level of literacy in DeKalb County, the library assists community literacy efforts by providing materials, space, and referral services. (10)

IL LVA-Elgin, Gail Borden Public Library. Provide adult literacy education in a non-threatening environment. (12)

Table LP1, cont'd

Family Literacy Partnership, Bensenville Library: Family Literacy Partnership existed [as a formal program] 92/93 & 93/94. Family literacy focusing on parent/child skills. Literature based. (2)

Libraries for Literacy in Lake County, Waukegan Public Library: Our mission statement says "...to extend educational opportunities to Lake County adult students and their families." (10)

IN Literacy Program, Michigan City Public Library: Our program provides individual tutoring through volunteer tutors for adult non-readers, low-level readers, intermediate readers who want to get a GED or go to college, and newcomers to our country who need to learn conversational English. We also offer a family literacy program aimed at helping parents read to their children. Recently we opened our program to children who are tutored both at the library and at school. Numerous requests from parents for such help moved us in this direction along with the fact that adult enrollment has dropped due to greater job availability at present. (8)

Library Literacy Program, Anderson Public Library: We're in the business of helping adults over the age of 16 who are not in school improve their reading and writing skills through the use of volunteer tutors in one-on-one or small group instruction. We also help adults who are learning ESL in the same way. We offer phonics and computer instruction, as well. (10)

Knox County Literacy Program, Knox County Public Library: To promote the Library as a lifelong learning center. To promote public awareness and community involvement in solving civic, social, educational, health, and employment problems. To provide basic reading, writing, spelling, and math help to adults and families. To provide tutor training services, as well as materials for students and tutors, adult new-reader and circulation literacy collection. To develop cooperative links with area businesses and community/social organizations also interested in working with adult nonreaders or beginning readers, etc. (4)

KS Project Finish, Johnson County Library, Shawnee Mission: Provide learning opportunities for adults 16 years of age and older who are no longer enrolled in school and have not obtained a functional basic education. Instruction is directed toward mastering competency skills in English, including speaking, reading and writing English, and basic math skills. In addition, preparation for the GED exam is provided. (10)

MA Read Write/Now Program, Springfield City Library-Mason Square Branch: To provide adult basic education and a family literacy program using a whole language-based model. Curriculum is developed based on learners' interests, needs,and goals. (8)

Table LP1, cont'd

Center for New Americans, Jones Library: To facilitate access, communication, and linkages with newcomer groups and institutions, employers, and agencies in the Pioneer Valley. Accommodate the varying needs/schedules/interests of students by providing a choice of study options (classroom, one-to-one tutoring, computer-aided instruction) and support services (advocacy referrals, job search, childcare, counseling). (9)

Newcomer Family Literacy Project, Lawrence Public Library: The Library's ESOL-based family literacy program integrates language and literacy studies with parenting skills and library skills development. Curriculum is grounded in exercises that use the library to increase the ability of newcomers to communicate in English, develop independent learning skills, gain exposure to technology, and become more effective parents. (8)

Literacy Program, Thomas Crane Public Library: To provide instruction in basic reading and writing to adults in order for them to meet their needs and reach their goals. (10)

MD Project Literacy, Howard County Library: Project Literacy provides free one-to-one instruction by volunteer tutors to any adult who lives or works in Howard County. Clients come to learn how to read, improve their reading/writing/speaking skills, learn English, learn functional math skills, and learn how to function in a literate society. (8)

MI MARC Literacy Program, Greenville Public Library: Our program] provides one-to-one tutoring to adults in Montcalm County having 0-8 grade reading or math skills, and teaches ESL to ethnic minorities with limited English-language proficiency. (9.5)

MN Franklin Learning Center, Franklin Community Library, Minneapolis Public Library: Provide free, flexible, self-paced instruction to adults aged 16 and older who read, write, and compute below a 12th grade level. [Basic goals are] to serve 450 learners a year, improve skill levels in 35% of enrollees, recruit/maintain 60 tutors a year. [Another goal is] to collaborate in at least 4 multicultural, multi-agency presentations (sic). (7))

Linking Libraries & Literacy for Lifelong Learning, Lexington Branch Library, St. Paul: Develop an active partnership between the library and the Hubbs Center for Lifelong Learning of the Saint Paul Public Schools, creating a successful link for adult learners with the free and easily accessible resources of the library. Staff training for the organizations includes hands-on training in new CD-ROM products, joint orientations, and sessions to address the needs of adult learners. Hubbs staff and students will help the library select new adult reading materials. A direct computer link to the library on-line catalog and its "information kiosk" will be installed at the Hubbs Center. (1)

Table LP1, cont'd

NC Community of Readers, Glenwood Library: Library directs Community of Readers, a network of over 50 organizations and agencies working to promote reading and literacy. Three branches offer classes n the library (GED, ESL). All libraries provide materials. (6)

NE Platte Valley Literacy Association, Columbus Public Library: In cooperation with Central Community College, [the Association] provides ABE at no cost to students 16 years or older, and not enrolled in school. This includes English as a second language classes, preparation for GED testing, basic adult literacy self-study, and living skills. In addition, PVLA offers tutoring for adults and a family literacy program for adult students and their families and at-risk families in the community. We are located in the public library and receive in-kind support, but do not receive funding through the City or the library. (15)

NJ Basic Skills for Reading & ESL, Elizabeth Public Library: Our program's overall purposes and goals are to improve the basic skills for English, reading, and math for adult residents of Elizabeth. (9)

Literacy for Non-English Speakers, Paterson Free Public Library: Our overall purpose is to empower our students [to take control of and be able to] change their own lives. We follow a student-centered approach, allowing learners to focus on what they feel they need to learn. We encourage them to progress from learning how to read to reading to learn. We hope they'll take a more active interest in their own community. (5)

NM LVA-Socorro County, Socorro Public Library: Provide basic reading, ESL, computer literacy and family literacy programs. (6)

NY Library Literacy Center of Prendergast Library, Jamestown: The Library Literacy Center is a library-sponsored, Laubach-affiliated, adult basic literacy program which, using adult volunteer tutors, provides one-to-one literacy help to adult learners who come to us for help. Although our primary focus is the teaching of reading, we also try to work with the student's other literacy needs such as math, spelling, GED preparation, if we are able and if the student wants that kind of help. (3)

Literacy Program, Brooklyn Public Library: To teach adults how to write and read and navigate life intelligently using technology and all resources available to all citizens. (18)

Centers for Reading and Writing, New York Public Library: **Population Served:** As part of the NYC Adult Literacy Initiative, [we fulfill our] commitment to neighborhoods throughout the City by providing culturally diverse populations opportunities for lifelong learning. The Library is committed to serving adult learners who have a range of personal, professional,and occupational goals.Within the NYC provider network, the libraries are mandated to offer literacy instruction to adults who are at the beginning stages of their reading development (0-4.9). Without [our] program these learners would have limited access to instruction as they would test too low on standardized tests to enter Board of Education or Community College programs. In addition, budget reductions have forced the Board and CUNY to reduce the number of pre-GED classes offered. **Program Development:** The Centers are committed to remaining current in instructional methodology, assessment procedures, curriculum development and the implementation of new program initiatives. **Volunteer Training:** In NYC, the Library literacy programs are funded as volunteer programs. New York Public Library is committed to the recruitment and training of volunteer tutors,who are the primary providers of direct instruction. **Collection Development:** Part of our funding is allocated to develop collections of print materials for adult new readers. These collections, located at CRW sites, can be borrowed by all students enrolled in the program. The Library also makes these resources available to practitioners at other NYC literacy programs, in the form of deposit collection loans. Instructors may visit a site and select materials appropriate for their classes. Over the past 12 years, the Library has established Lifelong Learning collections at all 82 branch libraries. These are available for borrowing by the general public. **Technology:** Computer instruction is used in the 8 CRW programs. We have been working since FY94 to upgrade hardware and software to enable students to capitalize on multimedia advances in educational technology. **Family Literacy:** We have embarked on a system-wide initiative to expand family literacy. As a result of a series of workshops in early 1995, we are currently engaged in developing a Families Writing curriculum. (11)

OK Moore Literacy Council, Cleveland County Library: The Council provides free, confidential one-on-one tutoring to any adult in the area who wants to learn to read or to improve reading skills. (5)

Great Plains Literacy Council, Southern Prairie Library System: To provide individual tutoring to low-level literacy and ESL adult students in order to raise the literacy level of our country and enable people to become more competent employees, parents, and citizens. We target families through special parent reading programs and the workplace through a business site ESL class. (10)

Literacy Council of LeFlore County, Buckley Public Library: To provide tutoring in reading and the English language to adults in the 1,510 square mile county; train tutors and trainers; promote the interest and cooperative efforts of other groups in the community; work cooperatively with other literacy providers in the state and nation. (10)

Table LPI, cont'd

OR LEARN Project, Eugene Public Library: LEARN (Literacy Education and Referral Network) draws a variety of people and agencies together to solve problems of common interest regarding adult basic and bilingual education, serves as support services for volunteer tutors and their organizations, provides books and materials to all county libraries and volunteer groups, recruits volunteers and students, referring them to appropriate education or other resources. (10)

PA Reader Development Program, Free Library of Philadelphia: The RDP enhances the Library's role of provider of support for learners of all ages by locating, evaluating, purchasing, and distributing to Philadelphia literacy agencies and to individual adults the best learning materials written on a low reading level on a wide range of subjects. RDP serves adults of all ages, ethnic backgrounds, and learning needs. RDP also stocks a wide range of low-reading-level leisure reading materials, providing adult new readers with popular genre books written on the 8th grade reading level or below. RDP also provides limited amounts of GED materials to satisfy state funding mandates. (28)

Bradford-Wyoming County Literacy Program, Bradford County Library: The goal of our Literacy Program is to reduce illiteracy in Bradford and Wyoming Counties. The Literacy Program trains volunteer tutors and provides free and confidential one-to-one tutoring for adults and teenagers. It recruits, trains, and supports volunteer tutors. It also provides support for its adult literacy students. (15)

RI LVA Kent County, Coventry Public Library: Our literacy program provides tutor training in Basic Literacy (reading and writing) and ESL to help functionally illiterate adults to improve reading, writing, and conversational English skills. (15)

SC Literacy Program, Greenville County Library: For many years we have provided materials, a board member for the local literacy agency, tutoring space.and encouragement to the community effort. Now we are becoming more directly involved by designating space at a new branch to be used by that community literacy association. We have also conducted an award-winning literacy awareness campaign, always working very closely with the Greenville Literacy Association. (?)

TX LVA-Sterling Municipal Library: Teach adults to read and/or speak English in 0-5 reading level. Orient these adults to all library services. Prepare adults to succeed with their tutors by teaching basic study skills. Create lifelong independent library users. (10)

Literacy Center, El Paso Public Library: The Center assists individuals of all ages find the services and resources they need to learn how to read and write, to become legal residents or U.S. citizens, to obtain their ED, to become computer literate, to know how to use the library, and to help them achieve their goals and develop their knowledge and potential. Since 1989 the Center offers five areas of service free to the public: information and referral, a materials collection, instruction services, community outreach and promotion, and research and development. We provide computers for self-paced instruction, recruit and train volunteer tutors and match them with students, offer library facilities to outside agencies and volunteer tutors for small group literacy and ABE education. (6)

Proyecto Adelante, Weslaco Public Library: To teach ESL, pre-GED, and GED to help any person from the area who wants to study. (7)

Literacy Programs, Harris County Public Library: To increase opportunities for adults in the surrounding communities of 11 branch libraries to receive individual or small group instruction in literacy or ESL using trained volunteers and materials. (8)

Andrews Adult Literacy Program, Andrews Public Library: We try to meet everyone's goals. We provide ESL, pre-GED, GED, citizenship, and of course, basic literacy for those who can't read at all. Many of our students have graduated from high school, but do not have skills to attend college. Some just need special skills, such as typing. We assist them in filling out forms or studying for special projects at work. Our biggest classes are pre-GED level: those reading at a 5th-8th grade level. (10)

UT Bridgerland Literacy, Logan Library: We provide one-on-one literacy and ESL instruction to adults in Cache County (northern Utah). Instruction is provided by trained volunteer tutors, and is free and individualized. Curriculum is closely tied to individual goals and needs, especially goals relating to parenting, jobs, or personal skills. (8)

VA Literacy Program, Newport News Public Library: There are four (4) components to the Newport News Library System's Literacy Program. We provide individual tutoring, workplace literacy and pre-GED classes, and also family literacy programs. Our focus is to provide a skills enhancement program that will diminish the cycle of intergenerational illiteracy. (10)

WA Project READ, Longview Public Library: Family literacy program—offers literacy tutoring to address the needs of the adult learner and at the same time teach the adults the skills and attitudes they need to help their children and grandchildren be successful learners in school. The focus is intergenerational learning and support. (9)

Library Literacy Program/Lifelong Learning, Seattle Public Library: Our literacy programming includes services for both native English speakers and limited English speakers. We operate a Literacy Action

Table LP1, cont'd

Center where one-to-one tutoring takes place, and where we provide an in-house lending library, computer access for students, and a mentor program for volunteer tutors. The Center is a special project of Washington Literacy. The Library collaborates with the Literacy Center in a family literacy program called Start Smart,which is coordinated by the Children's Librarian. Other programs/services include Born to Read (for mothers with newborn or very young children), The Reading Place (space in the Central Library and 10 branches where students and tutors may use books and other information for the new adult reader), and various ESL services including direct instruction, audiocassette technology and a special ESL reading collection. (9)

WI LVA Chippea Valley/Eau Claire, L.E. Phillips Memorial Public Library: An affiliate of LVA national, we serve as the national LVA liaison for the state of Wisconsin. LVA-CV provides literacy services to adults and families in a regional area where some 60% of the population lives on farms or small communities. We provide one-to-one tutoring and recruit and train volunteer tutors for the program. Sharing the mission of our national parent organization, we strive to develop strong local partnerships...create community awareness... develop effective funding strategies...undertake effective student and tutor recruiting and instruction...provide facilities conducive to learning...operate family literacy programs...support workplace education programs...and pursue "cutting edge" developments in techniques and materials, including greater use of technology where appropriate. Based on the work of a Strategic Planning Committee, we have adopted a long-range plan to further develop our outreach and effectiveness. (10)

WV Literacy Program, Monroe County & Peterstown Public Libraries: To provide a comprehensive literacy program that serves all segments of the population of Monroe County. To promote family literacy in reading, writing, and math. To develop and implement a training program for tutors of math. To remove barriers that prevent a rural population from participating in literacy programs. (6)

The overarching purpose of most of the programs is to help low-skilled, out-of-school adults acquire the reading, math, and ESL proficiency needed to meet their personally determined functional goals.

Respect for students, for the process of learning, and for individualized curricula and teaching pervades the thinking.

A focus on one-on-one and small group tutoring—with heavy use of volunteers in the instructional role—is strongly in evidence.

The majority of programs concentrate on serving the most poorly skilled adults (often expressed in 5th-6th grade-equivalency terms)— although GED-preparation and ESL services are standard program features as well.

Another common thread is a serious and growing interest in family literacy.

Many of the programs are LVA and Laubach affiliates housed in the local public library. [Note: While this is only *suggested* by the Table LP 1 profiles, explanatory comments in several tables of the background data book validate the observation.] Some are obviously programs of other kinds of community-based organizations. A few have employment as a goal of instruction. Others are programs actually staffed and operated by the libraries.

POPULATIONS SERVED

The point that needs emphasizing most is that in providing basic literacy services to adults at the lowest end of the proficiency spectrum, public libraries are giving educational access to people most in need of help and most likely *not* to get it from schools and traditional ABE programs.

The profiles make it clear that this service focus is the most unique and defining feature of public library adult literacy programs.

Demographic and program data supplied in LP 2 and LP 5 reinforce the point. For example, of the approximately 53,000 students served by these 63 programs in FY95, more than half (55%) were members of economically and socially disadvantaged minority groups (32% Hispanic, 23% Black). Some 36% were unemployed, and, conversely, 50% were employed either part-time or full-time. A full 93% were between 17 and 59 years of age.

Too little data was given to produce corresponding percentages for those on public assistance and those who had not completed high school, but notes included in the background data book indicate

LP2. By percentage, indicate the makeup of your adult student body in FY95 by age, ethnicity/race, gender, employment status, whether on public assistance, and other demographic variables you consider important. [Q4 only]

Gender	Male 45%	Female 55%		(Of approximately 53,000 students)		
Ethnicity/Race	Black 23%	White 30%	Asian 11%	Hispanic 32%	NAmer 1%	Other 1.5%
Work Status	Employed 50%		Unemployed 36	Retired/Other 14		
Age Group	16 & Under	17 to 25/29	25/29 to 44/49	45/49 to to 59	60+	
	3%	22%	55%	15%	6%	

Note: Most programs did not give data on the number of students on public assistance or on education attainment (many apparenty do not collect it). But notes added to the data supplied indicate a heavy school noncompletion rate among the adult literacy students of the programs, as well as heavy public assistance rates.

LP3. How many years has your program been in operation? [Q4 only]
LP4. How long have you been in your present position? [Q4 only]

On Average, Years Programs in Operation	9.9 years
On Average, Years In Present Position	6 years

LP5. Please indicate the size of your program in FY95 with respect to the following indicators:

	A All Programs	B Without 3-6 Programs That Seriously Skew	
# Full-Time Staff	Range: 1 to 25 Total: 138.25 Average: 2.2	Range: 1 to 6 Total: 79.25 Average: 1.34	a
# Part-Time Staff	Range: 1 to 34 Total: 196 Average: 3.1	1 to 8 Total: 110 Average: 1.9	b
# Paid Staff (FT & PT)	Range: 1 to 55 Total: 320.25 Average: 5	1 to 8 Total: 144.25 Average: 2.62	c
# Voluntary Staff	Range: 1 to 900 Total: 6,623 Average: 105	1 to 243 Total: 4,063 Average 73	d
Operating Budgets	Range: $2,500 to $1,189,013 Total: $5,713,011 Average: $92,145	$2,500 to $176,000 Total: $2,765,403 $44,134	e
#Students In FY95	Range: 11 to 28,636 Total: 53,242 Average: 858	Range: 11 to 600 Total: 8,537 Average: 152	f

a Excludes NYC & Broward County (FL) programs
b Excludes NYC and 2 LVA programs
c Excludes NYC, 2 LVA, & 3 Other Programs
d Excludes 6 programs whose volunteers number between 300-900
e Excludes 5 programs w/budgets $250,000+, incl. New York & Brooklyn @ $1,032,000 & $781,000
f Excludes 5 programs with students of 1,500+, incl. RDP (Phila.) @ 28,636 & DeKalb County (GA) @ 8,448

that the rate for both in FY95 was very high. Moreover, a disproportionately high percentage of students in voluntary and CBO adult literacy programs generally are known to have these characteristics.

PROGRAM LONGEVITY

The programs included in this survey are about ten years old on average (LP 3). But, as the background data book shows, only thirteen of them (21%) have been in existence for thirteen years or more—predating the time (around 1983) when the national adult literacy movement began to gather full steam. This means that some 80% of the programs appear to have come into being as a result of that movement.

Interestingly, the background data book shows that about 74% of the programs have been in operation ten years or less, corresponding to the time period in which LSCA Title VI grants have been made (the first round was awarded in FY86). This fact has great importance in considering the heavy dependence the programs have on federal funding (see LP 6). At the time of questioning, some 65% of

LP6. What are your principal sources of funding? Check all that apply, giving relative percentages if possible. [Q4only]

Q4 Local Programs (63 of 63 responded, 100%)

	# (%) of Respondees Indicating This Source	% Of Total Funding
Federal grants	41 (65%)	39%
Local government	40 (63%)	28
State government	25 (40%)	10
State library system/agency	24 (38%)	8
Foundation grants	16 (25%)	4
Individual donations	29 (46%)	3
Local/state business & industry	19 (30%)	2
Other*	20 (32%)*	6*

* The main source cited under Other was the United Way. Also included, although infrequently, were such sources as Veterans of ForeignWars/Chamberof Commerce, Friends of the Library, special projects such as spelling bees, the regular library budget, service organizations, LSCA, and local government in one form or another.

the programs surveyed had partial federal funding, with federal grants accounting for some 40% of their total overall funding. (State funding was very small at 10% of the total.) This relationship is just another indicator of how the muscle, perhaps the survivability, of so many of the programs will be affected by the loss of LSCA Title VI funding (unless an adequate level of federal funding is retained in some other form and earmarked for library literacy).

It is interesting to note in passing that directors of the programs have, on average, been on their jobs for about six years (LP 4), long enough to have their fingers solidly on the pulse of local literacy needs and to fully understand the pressures under which their programs operate. But only about one-third of them have been in their positions long enough to know firsthand what life was like before LSCA Title VI.

GETTING BLOOD FROM A STONE

The findings of Question LP 5 underscore once again just how much library literacy programs have been doing with extremely limited resources. In this respect, they are like the SLRCs.

As Column A shows, in FY95, the 63 programs included in the survey had, on average, only 2.2 full-time staff members and 3.1 part-time staff, for an overall average of 5.3. Of this total, 5 were paid staff (94%), and the rest donated their services. The average number of volunteer tutors in the programs was 105 (the range extends from 1 to 900). The average number of students served was 858 (ranging from 11 to 28,636). And the average program budget was about $92,000 (ranging from a low of $2,500 to one at $1.2 million).

Looked at another way, using Column A averages, in FY95 there were:

1 full-time staff member for every 390 students

1 paid staff for every 172 students

1 volunteer tutor for every 8 students

$107 spent during the year per student

Column B probably provides a more realistic picture, however, because it omits the three to six very large programs that skew Column A results.

According to Column B, in FY95 the programs had only 1.34 full-time staff members and 1.9 part-time staff, for an overall average of 3.2. Of this total, 2.6 (81%) were paid staff, the others donated their services. The average number of volunteer tutors in the programs was 73 (the range extends from 1 to 243). The average number of students served was 152 (ranging from 11 to 600). And, the average program budget was about $44,000 (ranging from a low of $2,500 to a high of $176,000).

LP7. In which size population area is your program located?

Q4 Local Programs (61 respondees of possible 63, 97%)

	# Programs	% of Total
Under 1,000		0%
1,000 to 2,499		0
2,500 to 4,999		0
5,000 to 9,999	3	5
10,000 to 24,999	6	10
25,000 to 49,999	5	8
50,000 to 99,999	15	25
100,000 to 249,999	13	21
250,000 to 499,999	5	8
500,000 to 999,999	8	13
1 million plus	6	10

LP 8. Which of the following are regular services/features of your library literacy program?

Q4 Local Programs (61 responses of possible 63, 97%)

Provide/develop book collections for adult new readers	97%
Provide/develop student/tutor learning materials	97
Provide space for classes/meetings of other groups	90
Provide information and/or teferral dervices	94
Provide tutor training/direct instruction with own staff	89
Use computer technology for program management purposes	83

LP 9. If your program provides direct tutor training and/or instruction,which of the following components does the instructional program have?

Q4 Local Programs (56 responses of 63 , 89%)

One-to-one tutoring	89%
Regular collaboration with outside agencies/providers	88
ESL	79
ABE	79
Use computers for instruction/training	79
Use TV/video for instruction/training	71
Family literacy	64
Small group tutoring	64
Off-site instruction	57
GED	34
Workforce/workplace literacy	25

LP 10. If your program provides direct tutor training and/or instruction, please indicate the basic educational philosophy that guides it, indicating the curricular & instructional approach taken (e.g. whole language, phonics).

Q4 Local Programs (53 responses of 63, 84%)

Whole language base	40%
Phonics base	28
Eclectic/Other	32

On average, then, in all but the largest programs, there were in FY95:

1 full-time staff member for every 114 students

1 paid staff for every 47 students

1 volunteer tutor for every 2 students

$290 spent during the year per student

Whether one prefers either of the above measures or others that could be derived from the data given, the basic point is clear: adult literacy programs and services offered by public libraries do so by rubbing pennies. No other part of the educational world is given so little to work with.

STABLE FUNDING: A SURVIVAL ISSUE

That library literacy programs are a clear financial bargain is a positive feature to be recognized in any future effort to more clearly articulate their unique role and purpose.

But the downside is that where everything humanly possible has already been wrung from inadequate budgets, even a small funding cut can spell disaster.

So, again, **thousands of library literacy programs appear to be facing a bleak future: if present funding trends continue most will lose muscle from their programs and many will be forced to close.**

(Section 4 of this report, in questions F2 and F3, was very clear on this point where loss of federal funding is concerned—although local program respondees don't seem to recognize this as fully as the other three respondent groups do.)

The responses to question LP 13 make the point in more specific terms: Lack of stable funding and equitable access to it is the most widely perceived barrier to future program success and survivability. But in LP 13 the programs also point to overburdened staffs...the shrinking pool of volunteer tutors (*necessitating more paid staff*)...long tutor and student waiting lists...lack of space...and weak state and national commitment—common refrains throughout this study and essentially problems of funding.

LP11. If your program provides its own instruction and/or tutor training services, what percentage of the instructional/training staff are:

Externally-recruited ABE professionals and/or volunteers	81%
Librarians/library staff	14
Other	4

LP12. Please check any of the following services that your program receives regularly from the following four sources.

Q4 Local Programs (61 responses of 63 possible, 97%)

	State Library Agency	Regional Library	SLRC	Other Entity
State advocacy	50%	33%	44%	23%
National advocacy	23	15	28	33
Public awareness	28	57	43	43
Policy development & planning	8	46	23	11
Statewide conferencing	41	15	46	41
Professional staff development	25	38	54	38
Program development	15	44	26	34
Curriculum development	2	26	26	31
Evaluation/assessment	13	21	23	36
Training tutors and/or trainees	7	31	20	41
Applying research to practice	7	15	18	21
Fundraising/resource dev.	8	41	15	31
Data collection & analysis	23	28	28	26
Lending library resources	26	54	31	13
Grant funds	49	31	15	41

OTHER PROGRAM FEATURES

Questions LP 7 - LP 11 reveal a variety of other program characteristics, some of which confirm findings suggested earlier and some that raise other interesting issues which invite future research attention:

The 63 public library literacy programs included in this study represent towns and cities of virtually every *population size* (LP 7). That they have a great deal in common is obvious.

The provision and development of *book collections and learning*

It is quite significant that the average life of most programs in this study (with the exception of the pioneer programs) is about 10 years. To me, this shows the correlation between Title VI funding and the establishment of new programs. The end of Title VI will be "crunch time" for many of them. Over and over and over again throughout the survey is the cry for solid, stable funding. Part of the problem comes from the communities themselves which have chosen to rely on "soft money" because it has always been there. Library literacy programs have not been solidified in the library budget...and are always looking over their shoulder to avoid a disaster "next year." Of course the problem is not unique to library literacy programs. (Shelley Quezada, MA) *materials* for students and tutors is the most consistent service feature across all programs, regardless of size, population base, or type (LP 8). A full 97% of the local public library literacy programs provide such materials.

Some 89% of the programs provide direct tutor training and instructional services using their own paid staffs, but the data do not tell whether the programs are outside groups being housed in the library or programs directly operated by the library. Data given earlier indicate that the majority of library-based literacy programs are outside voluntary and CBO groups which have been given a home and library administrative supports. But library-staffed and library-operated programs, while probably not in the majority, are nevertheless known to be quite substantial in number.

LP13. What are the 2-3 greatest barriers to effective service in your program and in the nature and extent of your outreach?

Q4 Local Programs (53 respondees of 63, 84%)

	# Times Cited
Lack of stable/adequate funding/impending government decreases	42
Poor funding access	3
Funders favor project suport over basic operating suport	1
Turf battles/difficult to compete with more powerful ABE-GED interests	3
Too few staff/too few qualified staff	**12**
Too few resources for staff/teacher development and training	**5**
Pool of volunteer tutors is shrinking/more paid staff needed to tutor	**3**
Too much staff time needed for fundraising	**3**
Barriers to student participation (e.g. childcare, transportation)	7
Community education misconceptions/ libraries not viewed as educational agents or partners	**6**
Too little media attention to keep national awareness/visibility up	2
Limited national commitment	2
Low state funding commitment	1
Little state library support	1
Tutor and student recruitment problems	**11**
Long tutor and student waiting lists	**2**
Retaining students/tutors	**2**
Lack of tutoring/program space	**6**
Poor coordination/collaboration among various groups	4
Limited hours of program operation	**2**
Limited understanding by librarians	**2**
Limited access to low-level, cutting-edge materials	**1**
Too little literacy staff involvement in library decision-making about their programs	**1**
The quick-fix mentality	**1**
Inability to diagnose learning disabilities	**1**
Barriers between children's and adult education programming	**1**
Interplay between employment status, skills required for jobs, and economic conditions	**1**

Furthermore, whether or not the library itself provides the direct instruction, programs of all types can have both external and internal staff—and volunteers are, of course, a feature of them all.

The response to LP 11 is similarly problematic. **Librarians and library staff themselves make up only about 14% of the instructional staff** in programs of direct instruction, with externally recruited adult education professionals and volunteers accounting for more than 80%. This gives a further sense of program texture and the nature of library involvement, but it doesn't reveal anything new about program type, extent of library commitment, or issues of training. The whole area is one that should be examined more carefully in future research.

Considering that library literacy programs generally serve adults at the lowest level and thus follow nontraditional instructional approaches, it is not surprising that among most of those surveyed (80%) there is **heavy reliance on one-to-one tutoring** (LP 9). But it is significant, in terms of instructional and cost effectiveness, that there has been a substantial adoption of small group instruction over the past decade or so, with 64% of the surveyed programs having this feature—usually in addition to one-on-one, not as a complete substitute.

With respect to **technology**, there was speculation in Section 2 that local programs are already making heavy use of computers. The responses to LP 8 and LP 9 confirm this. The tables show that some 83% of the programs surveyed use computer technology for program management purposes, while 79% use computers for instructional purposes. Furthermore, some 71% use television and video technology for instructional and training purposes (though the data don't show what form this use takes).

Other program features in evidence, as before, are the heavy attention to **serving ESL adults** (79% of the programs provide ESL services) and the high involvement in **family literacy** (64%).

It is also interesting that about 25% of the programs work in some way in **workforce and workplace literacy**. This finding is consistent with other study data, and the state program data in Section 5 (LAPD 2-4) suggests that in at least some states the level of involvement is even higher.

Moreover, one of the early advisors to this project, the director of the long-established Brooklyn Public Library literacy program, believes that library literacy service to part- and full-time employed persons should make the programs more fundable rather than less, but she worries that the extensiveness of this service is not fully recognized. Here is yet another subject in need of future attention.

WHOLE LANGUAGE PREDOMINATES

Question LP 10 aimed to identify the theoretical underpinnings of the instructional programs surveyed.

Of the 53 programs (84%) responding to the question, 40% are based on whole language principles (the basic approach of Literacy Volunteers of America). Some 28% are based on phonics (the traditional Laubach Literacy method). And 32% use a combination of approaches, some including whole language and/or phonics. [Note: Many programs based on whole language also use phonics to help students with their pronunciation.]

Very little useful research has been done on whether whole language, phonics, or other methods work best as the foundation for adult reading programs. Moreover, the answer might well differ depending on the actual make-up of the student clientele from program to program, a relationship the survey did not address. In any case, the issue is of secondary importance in the present climate, though it may be a good candidate for the future research agenda.

Nevertheless, it is worth noting that as understanding has grown about the motivational needs of adult learners and the importance of functional context learning, the use of whole language also has grown. It takes into account the background knowledge that adults bring to the learning experience. It starts from the knowledge that most low-skilled adults already have encoding and decoding skills; they just cannot read at a high enough level to be able to extract meaning from the material. And it recognizes intrinsically that the purpose of lifting adult basic skills levels is not to give individuals an arbitrary grade-level equivalency but to enable them *to do* something, *to function* in necessary tasks of living and working.

It is also worthy of note that in a 1988 study of 23 LVA, Laubach, and eclectic programs in Illinois, the Illinois State University found that LVA students had significantly more grade-level gain than students in the other two program types (as measured by the Slosson Oral Reading Test given at three-month intervals during a one-year period). Moreover, they did so even though they had much lower scores at the beginning than students in the other programs. In that same study, Laubach students using a traditional phonics-based program had the least gain, despite having tested highest at the outset.

LC1. What opportunities and advantages (or freedoms and creativity) are possible in library literacy programs specifically because they operate within a library culture?
[Q2, Q3, Q4]

Q2	State Library Literacy Contacts (30 of 44, 68%)
Q3	SLRCs (32 of 40, 80%)
Q4	Local Programs (62 of 63, 98%)

	Q2	Q3	Q4
Materials: Libraries give access to new reader materials, books, audiocassettes, free collections, video materials/are excellent sources of instructional & tutor training materials/ provide access to wide array of materials	13	18	36
Less formal, non-school settings/fewer requisites for participation, non-threatening to adults, flexibility in learning and teaching/user friendly/nondiscriminatory/stigma-free/ respectful of individuality, individual need/neutral sites/ focus on personal development	15	9	19
Provide an atmosphere that respects confidentiality/ anonymity	3	2	3
Libraries are linked to so many other resources/organizations/ have the freedom to work with other agencies as community education partners/are a referral source to other education and social services	3	1	4
Libraries' hours are longer and year-round, allowing for greater flexibility in scheduling literacy activities	5	2	5
Students become comfortable with library/learn library use/ can take part in library resources/programs before-while-after learning to read/exposure to speakers and activities not otherwise available/students can bring friends and family there	6	1	13
Libraries have trained, knowledgable, dedicated staff/ administrative supports/programs already in place that literacy programs can draw on	2	2	11
Libraries have buildings with space for classes and meetings/quality space	3	2	13
Libraries have varied resources available	2	2	9
Libraries have technological resources for tutors & students/ including computers, faxes, photocopiers, etc./ Internet access	4	3	14
Libraries offer programs/access for the whole family/ are ideal setting for intergenerational activities	6	9	7
Libraries treat all patrons with respect as individuals, are nonjudgmental	5	1	4
Libraries have a public service culture and provide open access to everyone	2	3	1
Libraries are a recognized natural setting for reading and learning/they foster respect for and use of knowledge/ students are surrounded by peers who love to read/ shared love of learning to read	2	4	15
Location: proximity to home or work makes libraries very responsive to community need/very accessible/ central location	1	3	3

STATE LIBRARY TECHNICAL SUPPORT IS SUBSTANTIAL

Question LP 12 provides another measure of the support services local library literacy programs have been getting from three primary sources, state library agencies, regional libraries within the state, and SLRCs. The data show that all three sources provide significant help in areas of essential need, and that substantial help comes to the local programs from other sources as well.

Several aspects of the response are worth highlighting:

First, despite the fact that earlier tables show library literacy programs to be infrequently thought of by most SLRCs, the local programs indicate that the SLRCs provide them, on balance, with more extensive technical assistance help than state and regional libraries do.

Second, regional libraries have a larger overall technical assistance role than state libraries, and are the main source of public awareness help, policy development and planning, and fundraising assistance. They are also the largest provider of lending library resources.

Third, in the eyes of local programs, state libraries nevertheless provide some help in *all* substantive areas of need, and they have the dominant role in state advocacy and provision of grant funds. They also, have a major role in statewide conferencing activity.

Given the purpose of this study, the point that matters most here is that **although state library agencies are not the dominant source of most local program support, they are nevertheless a highly important source**.

Moreover, it is very significant that the local

Table LC1, cont'd

	Q2	Q3	Q4
Reference & research techniques are more easily taught in a library/training is available in the use of the library/opportunity to learn about role and importance of library	2	1	1
Libraries are subject to fewer regulations (e.g. class size, teacher credentialling)	3		2
Library patrons are a source of volunteer tutors	1		4
Libraries have a commitment to lifelong learning	1		3
Librarians/libraries are pro-active and offer a supportive environment	1		5
Libraries are avenues to information literacy/they instill sense of empowerment through reading and information services	2		2
Marketing and public relations efforts that are creative and ongoing	1		2
Literacy program is highly visible and has a built-in credibility because of location within the library/prestige of library enhances literacy program		1	12
Libraries are a source of staff training		1	2
Safety: Safe places for tutoring, especially in urban areas		1	1
Space and other services are free		1	3
Sources of literacy hotlines/helplines for all provider groups, adults of all ages	2		
Library-based programs are programs of choice	1		
Ability to sponsor tutor/student/business recognition events	1		
Flexibility—if something is not working, it can be changed immediately	1		
Quiet community-centered atmosphere		1	
More stable revenue stream if included as budget line item		3	
Statewide electronic network of information and materials		2	
Libraries sometimes provide the only literacy program in a community			1
Libraries provide access to federal and state grant money			2
Access to funding information/to funds			5
Literacy program is stronger because it can draw on other library programs/departments/services			5
Libraries give literacy programs direct contact with wide range of clients/with public			2
Library branches are a source of referral to main library literacy program/referral informaton is readily available/ library staff is adept at spotting nonreaders and making referrals			3
Literacy program is part of library's WWW home page			1

Table LC1, cont'd

	Q2	Q3	Q4
Volunteer tutors have an opportunity to recommend purchases for library's collection			1
Libraries are more trusted than other institutions			1
Students are exposed to diverse points of view			1
Library networks with large number of branches make extensive outreach possible			1
Inner-city locations expose students to cultural richness			1
Libraries help recruit volunteers, donors, and other program supporters			1
Libraries are a source of job referral to our literacy students			1

programs' think state libraries do less to help them than the state libraries themselves indicate they do.

For example, 50% of local programs say that state libraries regularly provide state advocacy services. But in LAPD 9, the corresponding state library response is 81%. For policy development and planning, the respective percentages are 8% and 53%! For professional staff development, they are 25% and 53%.

There are similar variations in the areas of national advocacy, statewide conferencing, program and curriculum development, and evaluation and assessment.

In short, the state library role appears to be very much more extensive than Table LP 12 shows. The strong difference in the perception of the two groups is alarming, once again signalling poor communications and information flow between the two levels.

In any case, if local programs are to continue to offer anything resembling effective instruction and outreach, the state library agencies may well need to do more in the future, especially if the SLRC role is diminished.

PROBLEMS & DIFFICULTIES IN THE LIBRARY CULTURE

A final area of questioning in this section looked at the advantages and difficulties that local library literacy programs experience specifically because they operate within a library culture.

Table LC 2 reveals some of the problems—from the perspective of the local programs alone.

Trouble competing for local education funds is the most-cited difficulty. Inadequate community understanding and lack of recognition and acceptance by traditional education sources are among the principal reasons for this handicap.

Compensation problems are a very close second. Some 47% of the respondees report that their staff are paid less than their education counterparts in non-library programs, while an additional 9% are paid less than equivalent library personnel.

In other words, **salary inequities exist in three of every five programs.** That library literacy staff remain on the job as long as they do given this major disincentive is both amazing and admirable.

Low status in the eyes of non-literacy library staff also stands as a significant problem. About 31% of the programs report this as a constraint, which may explain in part the problem of lower pay.

ADVANTAGES & OPPORTUNITIES IN THE LIBRARY CULTURE

Table LC 1 explores the opportunities and advantages (or freedoms and creativity) that library literacy programs enjoy because they operate within a library culture— according to state library literacy professionals, SLRC heads, and the local programs themselves.

As the table shows, libraries are seen as inviting and supportive learning environments for a whole host of reasons.

Among the top advantages is that **libraries provide an immense variety of free resources**—books, video and audio materials, access to small and complex technology, quality space, trained and knowledgeable staff, and other organizational supports. Individual programs of instruction located outside libraries could not afford such a rich accumulation of teaching and learning materials.

Equally important, **libraries provide an inviting, non-threatening, stigma-free environment that is respectful of adult learners**. They are friendly settings, where students are constantly surrounded by peers and other library users who have a shared love of and respect for reading and learning, where knowledge is quietly celebrated, and where on a daily basis people gain and enhance control of their own lives through the ready acquisition of knowledge and information.

LC2. Please indicate which if any of the following problems your library literacy program has because it operates within a library culture. [Q4]

Q4 Local Programs (58 of 63, 92%)

Trouble competing for local education funds	48%
Lower pay than outside education counterparts	47
Low status in eyes of non-literacy library staff	31
Lack of top management support	19
Recruiting difficulties	17
Lower pay than other library personnel	9
No problems	14
Other (please specify):	29

Need more Board involvement.
Concern about future funding.
Lack of class space.
Fundraising must be coordinated with other library fundraising priorities.
Not associated with educational institution.
Lack of full funding and staff.
Limited in scope because of budget and space.
Literacy regarded as a "sidebar" service in times of tight money.
Purchase of materials must compete with other library needs.
Public thinks we're funded by the City.
Short-term planning on part of library.
Lack respect of trained educational providers: "You librarians don't know pedagogy."
Overcrowding.
Non-readers don't want to enter *the* City reading institution, thus extensive public relations needed.
Library "staff" sometimes worries more about library's rules than customers' needs.

Befitting the nontraditional instructional approaches used and the clientele served by library literacy programs, **libraries by their very nature provide needed flexibility.** Library hours are longer and year-round, making it possible for literacy classes and activities to be scheduled more frequently and at convenient times. Because libraries are subject to fewer regulations than traditional education institutions, class size, teacher qualifications, and program content and methodology can be more freely customized to actual need. And programs can easily be redirected or adjusted if they are found wanting.

The quiet library environment is naturally conducive to learning. It is a trusted and safe haven, a very important issue in large urban areas. Its closeness to home and work makes it easy to get to, and its credibility and prestige in the community rubs off on the literacy program within.

Libraries are also seen by many of the respondents as comfortable environments for the whole family, an **ideal setting for intergenerational activities**. Indeed, numerous indicators in this study show a strong and growing interest in family literacy programming among the public libraries involved.

Many other advantages and opportunities are cited in the table as well, some very thought-provoking indeed. For example, the inner-city location of many public libraries give adult literacy students exposure to a great variety of cultural resources...students learn tolerance and understanding through exposure to people of diverse background and viewpoint... libraries give literacy programs a direct line to a wide range of potential clients...and library patrons are a ready source of volunteers.

Obviously, the advantages an adult literacy program has because it operates within the library culture are substantial and varied. They far outweigh the problems summarized above, problems that stand as a challenge to caring libraries and political entities, not as an indictment of the programs.

Taken together with the purposes and goals expressed at the start of this section, these benefits make it clear that library literacy programs are unlike any other, and that either on their own or in partnership with voluntary and CBO groups, public libraries are providing a vital and unduplicated service to hundreds of thousands of adults in literally thousands of communities across the country. In fact, in some communities, they appear to be the only source of adult basic skills help.

Library literacy programs provide better service because they can draw on the resources and attitudes of the library culture, but more than that, they *give back* immense benefits—to the libraries, to students and families, and to their communities, states, and the nation. Everyone benefits from their presence.

7: LIFEBLOOD ISSUES & LEADERSHIP

This final strand of the survey sought to give the respondents an opportunity to express *in their own words* what they believe most needs to be done to preserve and strengthen the adult literacy movement generally (Q3) and to protect and strengthen the role of public libraries in particular (Q1, Q2, Q4). The importance of the section lies not so much in what it adds by way of new information—although some is given—as in its underscoring of the findings and analysis of Sections 1 to 6.

In G1, the responses of the two state library groups (Q1, Q2) and of the local programs (Q4) are organized on a state-by-state basis rather than by category as has been done throughout the report. The intent is to give readers interested in state differences a way to spot easily some of the more obvious variations. Except for minor editing refinements, the responses are given here verbatim and in their entirety. This makes a very long table (17 pages), but it should be a useful and self-contained resource around which to hold future planning discussions.

In G1 the participants were asked what half dozen or so vital issues or problems they think most need attention at the national and state levels. As a matter of secondary importance, they were also asked where they would look for leadership help.

SECURING LIBRARY LITERACY SERVICES: CONSENSUS ISSUES

The table is a solid reinforcement of the recurrent themes and findings discussed throughout this report. For example, the need for stable funding is uppermost in nearly everyone's thoughts.

And over and over again respondents call for more publicity on the important and unique role of public libraries...for increased involvement of state librarians and library personnel in all state and national literacy planning (including workforce and workplace literacy)...for steps to assure equity in

G1. If the role of public libraries as literacy service providers is to be preserved and strengthened, what half dozen or so vital issues/problems do you think most need attention at the national and state levels? *(To whom would you most look for leadership in addressing these issues/problems?)* [Q1, Q2, Q4]

Q1	State Librarians (27 of 35, 77%)
Q2	State Library Literacy Contacts (28 of 44, 64%)
Q4	Local Programs (53 of 63, 84%)

Arkansas

Q1
Funding to provide space and staff to support library-based literacy programs.
Funding for technology—especially for rural libraries.
Eliminating barriers to public school-public library literacy cooperatives.
Establishing library-votech-industry cooperatives for adult literacy.
Establishing purchasing cooperatives for library literacy materials to reduce costs.
(State and national government, state literacy organizations, U.S. and state education departments. Need a task force on the state level with at least half of the membership of English-speaking and non-English-speaking persons having completed literacy training.)

Q4
Literacy Council of Hot Spring County, Hot Spring County Library
Continuation of library loan collections (*AR State Library*)
Literacy council and library shelves. (*State Library staff*)
Library/literacy relationships strengthened in every county. (*Address at county, regional, and state levels*)
Avoid block grants. (*Update and contact legislators at local and state levels.*)
Cut back of standards and measures set up for fully staffed (paid) adult education programs. Small literacy programs have 1-2 paid staff, all others volunteer.

AR River Valley Libraries for Literacy - Reading Together, AR River Valley Regional Library
Recognize that library has responsibility for supporting literacy.
Direct role of librarian as educator.
Public recognition of the need for funding.

California

Q2
LSCA VI helped many small libraries begin modest adult literacy programs, which then transitioned to large-scale CLC.

funding...for more collaboration, new kinds of partnering, and sharing of resources...for identifying effective program models ...for advocacy and awareness activities...for better record keeping and data collection...and for technical assistance help of all kinds.

POTPOURRI OF OTHER WORTHY IDEAS

But threaded throughout the already established "consensus" issues are an array of general and specific suggestions which, though mentioned only once by individual respondents, make a good deal of sense. They are distilled below to draw attention to them:

◆ To reduce costs, cooperatives should be established for the purchase of materials.

◆ To secure the future, long-term strategies should be developed, with built-in benchmarks for measuring progress.

◆ To assure access, childcare and transportation needs will have to be better met.

◆ Standards and measures set up for well-staffed larger programs should not be rigidly applied to small library literacy programs that rely on volunteers and have few paid staff. The burden could break their backs.

◆ In schools and colleges of library and information science across the country, increased attention should be given to adult literacy in the training of librarians.

◆ Research should be carried out to answer the question: What works in adult literacy programs, and what doesn't?

◆ A paid literacy coordinator, on at least a part-time basis, should be mandated for every public library in the country.

◆ Seminars of all kinds are needed, on how to build community understanding and support...get the most "bang for the buck"... get library trustees and directors to better understand and commit to the library's adult literacy mission...develop more supportive attitudes among librarians and library staff toward literacy programs... and get educational entities to more fully

(cont'd on p. 105)

Table G1 cont'd

	LSCA VI also provided important supplemental funds after year 5, which were included in base for state matching. AEA funds have increasingly supplemented CLC funding, but have been relatively small. *(Both of the LSCA functions are greatly needed to assure strong federal/state complementation/ partnership. Increased funding and access to it by CLC libraries would be very valuable.)*
Q4	Adult Literacy Program, Napa City County Library Funding.
	Adult Literacy Program, Alameda County Library, Fremont A concerted effort to incorporate a discussion about literacy services in library schools to ensure that librarians understand the role of library literacy. Strong state advocacy. Serious discussion about the role of volunteers and the need to professionalize the service. Greater voice from the field in the development of policies that affect programs.
	Partners in Reading, San Jose Public Library Need a stable source of funding. Too much time is spent searching for $$ instead of creating quality programs. Projects are created to impress funders rather than focusing on effective basic services. Need research on what methods work and what don't. A lot of tutoring goes on that generates positive feelings but isn't really effective. Local government needs to understand magnitude of literacy problem so they will be more inclined to fund library literacy programs at a higher level. There hasn't been a national public awareness campaign in quite a while.
	Commerce Public Library Adult Literacy Program Funding maintained or increased. Family literacy—bring the parents in with the children. *(For leadership: City Council, State Library)*
Colorado	
Q2	Funding. *(Local programs, legislature, work/ employment one-stop centers.)* Publicizing results. *(State office—unless it's gone.)*
Q4	Literacy Program, Mesa County Public Library District Progress of student shown to the public. Funding. *(Anywhere)*

Table G1, cont'd

Cooperative service. *(Between ourselves.)*
Transportation in many areas.
Our state library turned literacy and ABE/GED all over to the State Adult Ed Department.
(Locally our Human Services Council, library board, and business leaders know of the value of our program and the integrity of the staff. I would continue to look to them. Our state literacy coordinator is also very helpful, but her position will close with lack of LSCA funding. The Adult Education Department of the state is also helpful. Cooperative efforts exist between the library, college, school district, and Rocky Mt.-SER.)

Delaware

Q1 Provide national and state funding to support library-based literacy programs.

Q2 We need to be clear that libraries are critical because they provide access to information.
We may convince more decision makers of the implications of library use and literacy if we begin modeling information literacy skills for preschoolers.
(The American Library Association could provide leadership.)

Q4 Project Reads: Sussex County Literacy Council, Sussex County Department of Libraries
Recognition that learning to read is really important even with technology becoming the be-all and end-all.
Recognition that libraries do indeed have a place in the education of adults.
Evaluation tools and measures cannot be the same as ABE/GED measures.
Recognition that not all people want to learn to read to become employed.

Florida

Q1 It is not a problem for Florida libraries on the state level. However, it is an issue in other states and on the national level where libraries are not included in appropriate studies, funding decisions, and public awareness programs, and where libraries are not included in ABE and ESL policy and decision-making boards, steering committees, consortia boards, etc.
(The ALA, Library Programs of the Department of Education)

Q2 There will always be state library support for public library involvement in literacy in Florida.
Nationally, libraries need to always be one of the significant agencies included in all national research, marketing/public relations, and funding initiatives. Libraries also need to be included on all top level policy and decision making boards that address literacy education issues.
Promotion/marketing of libraries as viable alternative locations for learning to take place needs to be consistent, high quality, and ongoing.
(Primary leadership should come from the ALA as the national professional association, and Library Programs of the U.S. Department of Education. Secondary and/or joint partnership leadership should come from the Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services, the Attorney General's Office (crime nationwide as it relates to the lack of employability skills, education, etc.), the Department of Labor, etc.)

Q4 Project LEAD, Miami-Dade Public Library System
Publicity is a major issue.

Panhandle Library Literacy Consortium, Jefferson County Public Library
Public libraries should receive funding from DOE if we are going to service the schools.
It should be mandated that libraries have at least a half-time literacy coordinator paid by county to ensure continuance of programs.

Hillsborough Literacy Council, Tampa-Hillsborough County Library System
Funding. *(State Library)*
Publicity. *(Local media)*
Recruitment of volunteers. *(Every agency with direct public contact.)*

Literacy Program, Brevard County Library
It is imperative that public libraries be given access to federal grant monies for use by library-based literacy programs. Having to compete with local ABE programs for funding is not productive for either.

Table G1, cont'd

Each One, Teach One, Broward County Public Library

Funding available to libraries only.

Some structure outside the Department of Education that oversees allocation of funds to volunteer, grassroots, and library programs regardless of whetherthey do it the way the Department of Education does.

More emphasis on various approaches, less on numbers.

More focus on student needs and perceptions.

Center for Adult Learning, Jacksonville Public Libraries

How to get the most "bang for the buck." How can the dollars we do get be used to help the most people?

We must try to get more local funding through the local city government. If we continue to be funded with "soft" money we will always be in danger of having to close our doors.

More attention within our state library association to literacy issues. (I have not attended the state library association conference for the last several years because there were no literacy-related issues on the program.)

More awareness campaigns need to be carried out within public libraries.

Within each public library when roles are being discussed, someone must speak out for literacy. The public library is a lifelong learning center in the fullest sense of the word. We must become advocates for the 23% of our adult population who are functionally illiterate.

(On the national level I would look to the American Library Association for leadership. On the state level, the State Library and the Florida Literacy Coalition have been very effective. Locally, the Friends of the Library as well as the library board should be the leaders. There are other local groups, such as the local Laubach group, who count on the library for some services and should be willing advocates if called upon.)

Georgia

Q4 Learning Center, Athens-Clarke County Public Library

The State Library will have to commit more than "lip service" to literacy if we are going to make any headway. Right now, the state emphasis is on technology. They have to be made to realize that technology is a natural tie-in to literacy or vice versa. However, someone will have to make it a priority.

The leadership must recognize that libraries can and do play a major role in solving literacy issues in a community. This requires solid planning and a greater emphasis on advocacy and promotion.

Libraries must have access to adequate funding if they are to continue to play a pivotal role in literacy.

(Public library leadership is essential.)

Literacy Program, DeKalb County Public Library

Increased funding at all levels.

Increased recognition by library leaders (directors, trustees, etc.) and by many libraries of the importance of library literacy services.

Higher level of cooperation among all literacy agencies/organizations to present a united voice.

Accountability/measurement of outcomes.

Need for library representation on any boards, such as the proposed Workforce Development Boards, that will make decisions on allocation of funds.

Educating decision makers—governor and staff, legislators, county commissioners, congressional leaders—to the value of literacy programs not directly connected to employment.

(Leadership: local literacy coalitions, our governor for whom literacy is a priority, state library agency, GA Office of Adult Literacy, GA Library Association, GA State University Center for Adult Literacy and other literacy research centers, the ALA, National Center for Family Literacy, NIFL, Schools of Library and Information Science, NCLE, AAACE.)

Hawaii

Q1 [Recognition that] libraries are neutral facilities in communities.

[Recognition that libraries are ideal settings] for teaching and learning, for preschoolers, in-school youth, adults, and senior citizens.

[Recognition that] libraries provide hardware and software and network access.

[Appreciation] of fact that libraries mean stability.

Iowa

Q1 Recognition of the potential value of libraries as "community centers" for literacy services.

Table G1, cont'd

Additional funds to support these additional services.
Increased value of libraries and library services.
More staff training.
Promotion of libraries as centers for lifelong learning.

Q2 Publicizing the plight of the non-reader.
New adult reader support groups.
Expanding volunteer programs in libraries.
Expanding new adult reader collections
Preserving funding for SLRCs.
(For leadership: State Department of Education, SLRC)

Idaho

Q1 Libraries need to be recognized as part of the educational community.
More resources, including staff, space, and materials.
More publicity and help in identifying populations who can use these services.
(Note: In Idaho, the State Library plans more of a coordinating and consulting role rather than administering an ongoing literacy program. What is needed here is probably a better educational effort as to the role public libraries can play and a coalition-building effort.)

Q2 Funding.
Collaboration.
Use of technology.

Illinois

Q1 Coordination and education.
Training.
Opening state adult education funding to libraries.
Public libraries and business partnerships.
Computers.
(We are ready to continue to offer leadership from the state library. If not, a coalition of business, educational leaders, and others will be most helpful in our future efforts. We are concerned that on the national level the philosophical differences between literacy providers, educators, and some librarians still need to be addressed. In the meantime, we expect states and local communities to build on what we have been able to achieve in Illinois and we will continue our commitment regardless of money, but the shift will be to support rather than actual dollars at the state and local level.)

Q2 Building better communications between librarians and educators for more unified approach to literacy enhancement.
Better training for libraries and community organizations in program development, evaluation and accountability, and establishing standards and measures.
Open state adult education funding to libraries—in partnership with educators if that's the only alternative.
Developing workplace literacy components and resources by libraries.
Providing increased access to computers and available technology for literacy students.
(Leadership: I would look to an Interagency Coordinating Committee such as we have to address these issues. National organizations need to work together on solutions.)

Q4 LVA-Elgin, Gail Borden Public Library
Sufficient funding.
Qualified staff.
Sufficient number of volunteers.
Public awareness of issues.
Community support.
Support from outside personnel (e.g. board members, service clubs, etc.)
(Leadership: Secretary of State Literacy Office)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table G1, cont'd

Indiana	
Q1	There has to be a "consolidation" of effort in programming. Research of more practical impact of literacy vs. cost of illiteracy on our society economically and socially. Continued emphasis on marketing importance of literacy. Recruitment of more partners stating the urgency of a literate America from industry, service clubs and nonprofits, and foundations. Even greater emphasis on what a single individual can do to change the effects on another's life, thus the community, and eventually the world. Worker to worker, convict to convict, not just teacher to student. We are all teachers and students all the time. Develop more tools and techniques to teach in group settings via Distance Education, etc.
Q2	Help in determining what works, successful practices, model coalitions, technology, etc. Public education and public relations. More literacy student involvement in planning, etc. Continued cooperation between organizations at the national and state level.
Q4	Literacy Program, Michigan City Public Library Support of library literacy services by local and state library administrators, to include not just funding but provision of qualified personnel and also moral support and encouragement. Professional education of library literacy program administrators in the fields of literacy, adult education, reading, or education, so that they can be held in the same esteem as a professionally educated librarian. Widening the scope of library literacy programs to include services for children as well as adults. Too many children fall through the cracks at school. Cooperation between other library personnel and library literacy programs personnel in areas of publicity, public awareness, recruitment, etc. Adequate funding for materials, equipment, clerical assistance. *(Local and state library officials would need to address the above issues, and perhaps the state education department.)* Library Literacy Program, Anderson Public Library Funding. Support on all levels. The general public needs to understand that the problem still exists and that volunteerism can help. Literacy providers continue to need answers about how to help with specific problems such as learning disabilities, dyslexia, apathy, etc. Keeping adult education and literacy programs off the cutting block. People still need us. Accountability. How can we really prove we have an impact on people's lives? Do statistics really mean anything? *(Frankly, I don't know who to ask for help with my concerns. I'm going just about anywhere I can—the State Library, Internet, books of lists of funders through foundations, other providers.)* Knox County Literacy Program, Knox County Public Library Money for personnel, training, and staffing adequate to address program needs. Illiterate people are very often unaware that they have problems and need help, and never approach us for service. *(For help: Local and community foundations, first; regional and state philanthropic organizations, second; government at all levels, third. Community/county volunteers and media, especially non-print.)*
Kansas	
Q2	Money is the main issue of contention and competition. Money to do the work is the only issue: research, best practices, sharing opportunities, and ongoing training. *(Leadership needs to be shared between traditional adult education, community based programs (libraries), and other agencies and organizations. LVA and LLA have the vision to bring the players together at a Literacy Summit.)*

Table G1, cont'd

Q4 Project Finish, Johnson County Library, Shawnee Mission

Community partnerships between libraries and educational institutions, community centers, etc., need to be encouraged as a means of maximizing literacy services to the community.

Additional funding sources need to be located in order to maintain and improve existing programs.

Staff and volunteer tutor training needs to be maintained.

Kentucky

Q1 Funding. *(Legislature)*

Models of service. *(Department of Education)*

Standards of service. *(Department of Education, ALA, National Coalition)*

Training for fundraisers. *(Department of Education)*

Publicity. *(Department of Education)*

Massachusetts

Q2 Better examination and dissemination of what works.

Technical assistance for library programs, including how to do collaboration, grant writing, and conflict resolution.

Ways to address turf issues.

A greater presence of library-based programs at national ABE conferences like COABE and support to attend them. (If a librarian is allowed one out-of-state trip it is usually to an LLA or LVA conference. They cannot travel without funds.)

We still need to raise the issue/value of library-based literacy to the library community and we need to begin to clean house at home first!

Q4 Center for New Americans, Jones Library

ESL literacy: Many providers will not accept ESL students who are not literate already and many providers need training in how to teach these students.

Equity issues: We can't expect to hold on to good teachers and volunteer coordinators if they make less than half of what public school teachers make!!!

(Whole) staff education: Our entire library staff here has been wonderful in assisting and welcoming students to the library. But other libraries/library workers can be rather daunting to limited English speakers/newcomers. It is critical that ***all library workers*** know how to deal with newcomers with sensitivity and compassion.

Qualifications: Coordinators, teachers, and volunteer trainers must be ABE professionals, not librarians. They must have adult education credentials/experience and be paid accordingly.

Newcomer Family Literacy Project, Lawrence Public Library

Facilities development (construction money).

Technology acquisitions.

Staff development—train staff to use new technologies, train staff about new literacy resources available.

Improve relations with public education system.

More literacy volunteers.

(We would look to the School Department, State DOE, SABES (MA State System for Adult Basic Education Support), congressional leaders, the President.)

Literacy Program, Thomas Crane Public Library

A more tolerant, less exclusive educational philosophy at state and federal levels must drive policy issues that affect funding and instructional opportunity.

Learning disabilities and ADD are critical issues in the success of students and the choice of curriculum or instructional material.

More people who provide direct service to adult learners need to be more familiar with technology in order to instruct and develop programs.

(The educational community working with public libraries would provide the greatest leadership on literacy.)

Table G1, cont'd

Maryland

Q4 Project Literacy, Howard County Library

Validation from the state level of the importance of literacy in public library's mission given shrinking funding for libraries in general.

Continued availability of funding for the external high school diploma program.

More publicity on the scope of the U.S. literacy problem and its economic implications. At one point literacy was in the long-range goals for libraries in Maryland. Three years ago, after the White House Conference on Libraries denied literacy as one of the major goals, many local programs lost their literacy funding. Our State Library System supported a multi-million dollar "Lifelong Learning Library" at the Enoch Pratt Free Library. It is now a "regular" branch. Two other counties have limited literacy programs supported "in-kind" by their libraries.

Michigan

Q1 Adult literacy is just one of the needs that public libraries in Michigan need to address in the coming years, while funding for the daily operation of many public libraries is already inadequate.

At the state level, continue to encourage coordination and involved support among academic, library, volunteer, and education groups.

Continue to seek private sector grants and gifts. *(Library of Michigan Foundation)*

Adult education programs should remain a responsibility of local and state government, while volunteer literacy programs must be community-based. State, federal, and foundation funds should be supplemental to community funding of literacy services.

Publicize successful programs and assist with planning, coordination, and fundraising. *(State and national leaders)*

Emphasize fundraising, reporting, and fund management as well as literacy training. *(Literacy organizations)*

Coordination, planning and promotion, assigning of grant funds as available. *(State libraries)*

Funding should be competitive or discretionary, tied to specific projects. *(State and federal government)*

Q4 MARC Literacy Program, Greenville Public Library

Guidelines for training volunteers as a high level of instruction is maintained by all literacy programs across the state. *(Michigan Literacy Inc.)*

Designate funds specifically for library literacy services separate from other adult education funds or workplace education. *(Libraries and the U.S. Department of Education)*

Advocacy. *(National Institute for Literacy, LVA, and Laubach)*

Minnesota

Q1 Organization of literacy services is different in each state, but ongoing partnerships need to be continued. *(The state library agencies, state adult ed/GED/ESL office(s) plus state-level direct providers.)*

Educators and policymakers need to be continuously reminded of the roles of public libraries in adult literacy efforts. *(National organizations)*

Much more support must come from businesses. Too many complain about low skill levels in the workforce while only a few seem willing to invest in their workers. *(Business and industry)*

Q2 What's literacy? Clear definition of literacy is needed.

What's the literacy message? Consistent statement and widespread communication needed.

What is the purpose of the library? Definition, message, communication.

What is the citizen's responsibility? How does the citizen understand their connection and what they ought to do?

What long-term strategies are needed?

(The only leadership that is worth anything in the long-run comes from thoughtful, committed, persistent people.)

Q4 Franklin Learning Center, Franklin Community Library, Minneapolis Public Library

Libraries need to recognize literacy learning center services are essential. They are also a great outreach and marketing tool, especially when some libraries are wondering why circulation is dwindling.

Libraries could take the lead regarding information highway access.

Table G1, cont'd

Adequate staffing.
Adequate collection financing.
Adequate facilities.
Public relations.

Linking Libraries & Literacy for Lifelong Learning, Lexington Branch Library, St. Paul
Any stability in funding with block grants or programs would enable us to plan more effectively for the future. This is probably an impossible dream given the nature of federal, state, and local funding.
Not losing the funding for basic literacy materials and services with the rush to use technology effectively. Technology can be very helpful but we still need basic materials for new adult readers. GED test study guides, audiocassettes for those who know Hmong and are learning English, etc. This needs to come from all levels.
Any ways to increase staffing to cope with the increased demand for time-intensive services to new readers and immigrants in our community. This is a local budget issue with lobbying needed by Friends and advocacy groups to inform government officials.
(Leadership: ALA, PLA, Adult Lifelong Learning Sections has been invaluable for me in providing collection assistance, personal contacts throughout the country, ideas for programs or problem-solving, etc. They have provided a strong leadership role and information for ALA's legislative network for lobbying.)

Missouri

Q2 Libraries' role in providing library literacy services needs to be emphasized. *(American Library Association)*
Continuation of statewide programs. *(Missouri Library Association and State Library).*

Mississippi

Q1 Coordination of literacy programs.
Communication concerning literacy opportunities and resources.
Increased emphasis on family literacy.
Promotion of all library services to the community as a whole.
Meeting childcare and transportation needs of adult learners.
(Some of the needs could be addressed by using one-time grants to establish or enhance local literacy programs. Local funds should be sought to continue the programs.)

North Carolina

Q4 Community of Readers, Glenwood Library
Staff training.
Public awareness.
More collaboration with other agencies.
Coordinated fund raising.
Technology!

North Dakota

Q1 Delivery problems in rural areas.

Q2 Training for rural/small library staff who are mostly untrained in librarianship itself.

Nebraska

Q1 We have some excellent programs and leadership in place now. We would rather promote those efforts in a support role than initiate programs from our office. We do not have the resources to assume a leadership role in library literacy programs, due to many other commitments, not to lack of interest. In part this relates to other agencies and organizations which are leading literacy efforts. The best results occur due to local efforts. *(National and state organizations need to direct their attention to helping local organizations in literacy programs.)*

Table G1, cont'd

Q4 Platte Valley Literacy Association, Columbus Public Library

In our state the majority of literacy programs are sponsored by the state-funded adult basic education through the community colleges. The libraries do not play a large role in out-state Nebraska. In order to strengthen the library literacy services, and in order [to avoid] duplicate programs, the libraries and community college ABE coordinators must work together. In many communities there is the opinion that there is not a need for adult literacy assistance. What many people do not realize is that literacy levels which were acceptable 20 years ago no longer meet the needs of industry and our computerized society.

Workplace literacy must be supported in some way by the community's industry. At the present time in Columbus, our on-site literacy classes are free of charge to industry, unless they request more instructor time than we have budgeted. In that case, we provide materials and the teacher at their site, and they pay a flat salary to us for the instructor.

Our state senators will have a larger role in designating funds in the future. We must request that they visit our programs, listen to our needs, and realize that literacy is an important part of making our citizens self-sufficient.

We are working hard to educate our community about what PVLA is about. We hope to see positive results in support through volunteerism and donations.

New Hampshire

Q1 Statistical studies to show the value of these programs.

General education to the public about libraries and literacy programs.

Communication with non-library literacy providers about the advantage of libraries as literacy providers and literacy partners.

Funding!!!

New Jersey

Q1 The important support role of many public libraries needs to be recognized and stronger publicity in the community needs to bring attention to this service and highlight the public library as a supporting agency.

Q4 Basic Skills for Reading & ESL, Elizabeth Public Library

Vital issues are funds for training and matching tutors with learners, and payment to tutor trainers for running the literacy program. Generally speaking, writing to legislators brings a response to any questions and comments.

Literacy for Non-English Speakers, Paterson Free Public Library

Funding.
Personnel.
Training.
Technology.
Partnerships with other organizations, school system, and businesses.
Commitment to literacy, particularly family literacy.
Support from local, state, and federal governments.
Increase awareness of literacy's importance on local, state, and national level.
Provide sufficiently trained personnel to work in library literacy programs.

New Mexico

Q2 Development of planning/assessment skills at the local level so that local librarians can determine literacy training needs and the role their library should play.

Nevada

Q1 Legislation authorizing/endorsing.
Funding earmarked for libraries.
High awareness of library role.

Table G1, cont'd

New York

Q2

Accountability: Libraries are generally a step removed from being able to assess student accomplishments.

Decreased library funding in general. Libraries have other important missions as well as literacy. Literacy is labor intensive. Programs will face cuts.

Lack of record keeping. Libraries could benefit from accurately counting adult learner use or working with direct literacy providers whose students use the library. There is more literacy activity than librarians are aware of.

Legislation on the state and federal level that includes libraries.

Q4

Library Literacy Center of Prendergast Library, Jamestown

Better use of available funding (there may not be any new funding).

Within our state department of education designate and maintain a commitment of a certain portion of state education income to be used for library services. *(Board of Regents)*

Re-establish the liaison link between the state library and local libraries.

Local libraries should develop other sources of funding and try to minimize dependence on state and federal sources.

Literacy Program, Brooklyn Public Library

State needs to look at progress made in library literacy programs.

Ability of libraries to attract adults who are gainfully employed but wish to better themselves.

Centers for Reading and Writing, New York Public Library

Having library literacy programs eligible for educational funding sources other than those specifically designated for library literacy programs.

Library leadership needs to raise public awareness about library literacy programs and publicly support continued and expanded funding specifically for literacy.

The accomplishments of library literacy programs need to be documented and disseminated.

Library literacy programs need to be able to quickly adapt to the changes in the literacy community and restructure programs in order to meet the needs of the clients in areas such as welfare reform, workfare, and job training.

Professional educators need to be included in the design and implementation of library literacy programs.

There needs to be a partnership between librarians and adult literacy educators.

(Leadership and direction: Needs to be provided by local library directors, the state librarian, and professional librarian organizations such as ALA, PLA, and NYLA in partnership with local literacy education directors, State Education Departments, and national education organizations such as IRA and NCAL)

Ohio

Q1

Emphasis on literacy as a primary function of libraries.

Emphasis on cooperative ventures which involve schools/libraries.

Stronger emphasis on schools teaching children to read, giving them special help to achieve this goal.

(State library agency, state education agency)

Training for library staff interested in literacy projects.

Family literacy as a desired program.

More opportunities for providers to have exchanges of information.

(Professional organizations)

Oklahoma

Q2

Stable funding resources. More partnerships to this end.

(ALA, LLA, other national organizations)

Continuing publicity for library literacy programs; organize a publicity campaign similar to Project Literacy U.S. (PLUS). *(ALA, LVA, Laubach, Center for the Book, PBS)*

State and local programs need to speak with a unified voice.

Professionalism of volunteers. Help is needed getting the word out that volunteer literacy tutors are providing a valuable service and are "professional." Too often there is wide separation between professional educators and volunteer programs.

Table G1, cont'd

Record keeping and accountability. Determine a common reporting form, make the forms available, and report the results separately and combined so that the impact of library and volunteer community-based programs is known.
(Laubach and LVA)

Q4 Moore Literacy Council, Cleveland County Library

Outreach is our most pressing problem. There are still areas of Oklahoma that do not have any literacy programming at this time. If our State Literacy Resource Center is affected by the block grant issue, it will directly affect the start-up of new programs and the extended life of small, underfunded programs.

Great Plains Literacy Council, Southern Prairie Library System

Provide funding for a state-level literacy office to receive and diffuse issues and information.
Continue funding for tutor training.
Continue the SLRCs. They have been invaluable in compiling information.
Provide research and development in adult learning theories and teaching practices.
Continue the ESL tutoring/teaching program development.

Literacy Council of LeFlore County, Buckley Public Library

More cooperation between the State Department of Education and volunteer library-based literacy providers.
Recognition from state education departments of the success rate of and effectiveness of volunteer groups.
Some form of continuing financial support for literacy providers to provide for ongoing and continuing literacy efforts.
Recognition that achieving literacy skills carries implications beyond the purely economic or work-related skills.
(We currently look toward the OK Department of Libraries which provides strong, ongoing support for library literacy programs. The OK Literacy Coalition, a state-wide volunteer organization of literacy providers also provides resources, training, and support. Would like to see greater support from the State Department of Education, state government, and national literacy organizations such as Laubach Literacy Action and Literacy Volunteers of America.)

Oregon

Q1 We have taken a good run at fostering library involvement in adult literacy programs over the past decade or so. Perhaps it is now time for these local projects to sink or swim on their own. I am more interested in seeing public libraries strengthen programs for illiteracy prevention as opposed to remediation. Public libraries can do more to impact literacy by working with preschoolers, their parents, and their caregivers. This is where we are currently putting our emphasis in Oregon.

Q2 Envision and promote the library's role in literacy services provision. *(NCLIS, Center for the Book, Department of Education, ALA, state library associations, state libraries)*
Preserve funding for literacy tutoring programs. *(State Department of Education staying on top of federal and state funding proposals that affect literacy funding)*
Effective testimony from students, tutors, and programs.
Fulfillment of National Education Goals. If schools were successfully graduating students who learned to read and compute math, libraries may not need to preserve their literacy role. *(U.S. Department of Education, State Department of Education, state legislature for funding of schools)*
Encourage corporate donations/funding to volunteer tutoring programs. *(NCLIS, Center for the Book, Department of Education, ALA, national volunteer literacy organizations)*
More to prevent the need for literacy services by targeting library services on children and youth. *(Libraries)*
Encourage more library-daycare outreach, library-Head Start partnerships, library-parent contacts and family literacy programs in libraries. *(NCLIS, Center for the Book, U.S. Department of Education, ALA, state library associations, state libraries, state legislature)*

Q4 LEARN Project, Eugene Public Library

Continued improvement in training for BOTH paid staff and volunteers.
Continued improvement in books, materials, hardware and software.
Provision of resources to instructors, volunteer tutors, and students.

Table G1, cont'd

Space for teaching.
Addressing learning problems.
Recognition of volunteer efforts.
(Leadership: Libraries need to be a part of leadership. OCCS-Oregon Literacy Inc. Professional organizations for funded and volunteer programs. Schools, businesses, vocational, rehab, employment, welfare, and corrections agencies.)

Pennsylvania

Q1 Need funding for collection development and technology to support the work of literacy providers.
(At the state level, the Bureau of Adult Basic and Literacy Education, the PA State Coalition for Adult Literacy, and the PA Association for Adult Continuing Education)

Q4 Reader Development Program, Free Library of Philadelphia
Coordination: There is not a sense that each participating institution has a unique role under the guidance of the state library or state literacy agency.
Duplication: As a result of the above, there is unnecessary duplication of services. This should be eliminated in the interests of economic and bureaucratic accountability.
Funds: Technology costs $$$$$. Even the paperback books purchased by RDP are increasingly expensive: $8.72 is the average price per book in 1995; in 1993, the average price was $5.67.
(Leadership: One very effective group that provides leadership is the National Literacy Alliance Public Policy Listserv. Besides delivering information on literacy legislation, policy, and funding, it functions as a "call to action" when intervention is warranted. The messages relating to the Congressional budget hearings inspired even this passive participant to write to PA's senators and representatives to inform them of the impact of reduced adult literacy funding on their constituents.)

Bradford-Wyoming County Literacy Program, Bradford County Library
Funding.
Public awareness.
Use of technology.
Student recruitment.
Increased awareness of the value of library literacy programs.
Awareness that literacy is involved with many other social issues.
(Local: Adult education agencies, county government. State: Adult education organizations such as PAACE and Tutors of Literacy in the Commonwealth, State Director of Adult Basic & Literacy Education, State Legislators. National: Laubach Literacy Action, Literacy Volunteers of America, US Congressional leaders.)

Rhode Island

Q1 Role of libraries as information providers needs to be more widely understood.
Role of libraries as centers for lifelong learning at all levels needs to be better understood.
Libraries themselves need to be more proactive in this area.
There needs to be much more money assigned at all levels (national, state, local, private, and public) to support adult literacy in public libraries.
The economic benefits of literacy training (by whatever agencies provide it) need to be understood and recognized.

Q4 LVA Kent County, Coventry Public Library
Space for literacy programs in libraries.
More attention given to family literacy programs.
More help for tutors in learning how to work with learning disabled adults.
More research on the extent of adult illiteracy in the U.S. and its measurable effects on families and in the workplace, nationally and statewide.

South Carolina

Q2 Steady, ongoing source of funding for literacy programs.
Greater advocacy of libraries' role in supporting community literacy efforts.
Encouraging literacy agencies to use all community resources.

Table G1, cont'd

Q4 Literacy Program, Greenville County Library

The increasing gap between opportunity-rich and opportunity-poor. In SC, rural areas tend to be even further out of the loop and more underfunded than other areas.

Mistrust between agencies and parts of the state, especially in times of diminishing funds.

(Leadership: I would leave the state out of it and concentrate my efforts at coalition building among local agencies and the wonderful human resources at the federal level, which exist in people like Judy Stark at Education who is helping us with our grant. I think libraries themselves are the perfect institutions to take the lead — democratic, public, omnipresent. The ALA may already be putting forth leadership efforts. I'm just not aware of it.)

South Dakota

Q1 The need for leaders on both state and federal level to realize that illiteracy is an ongoing problem. Funding for short periods of time, 1-3 years then no funding, does not work. It takes 1-3 years just to develop the local programs and begin to reach the adult student. Funding must be continuous just as funding for elementary, secondary, and postsecondary education.

A secure and continuing funding base is required. Illiteracy is not a Republican or Democratic issue. It affects all citizens and impacts our economic growth as a state and a nation.

(Funding leadership must come from the federal level.)

Tennessee

Q1 We would work in a collaboration effort with state adult education leaders. The knowledge and expertise that has developed over a number of years of such collaboration has produced a vast amount of information coming from a number of national organizations. We feel we have an extremely well-informed state group.

Q2 The most important issue will be in dealing with personalities of leadership—whether that leadership understands all the issues of an uneducated citizens, whether it has an agenda that is totally informed.

Texas

Q1 Funding is the major issue—we can't do it without the resources.

Competing priorities are another impediment.

Turf issues are also significant.

(While libraries can play a key role in addressing adult illiteracy, they are not the only agencies involved. What is needed is a well-coordinated effort that uses the contributions of all involved agencies and organizations effectively—a network of providers. We need leadership to help develop such a collaborative approach.)

Q2 Funding for materials, staff, and training.

Convincing legislators that they have a vested interest in helping reduce illiteracy—educated voters, educated citizens.

Convincing legislators that in small, rurally-isolated communities, there are not enough volunteers to provide literacy and ESL programs. Distance learning would help, funds would help.

Funds for permanent staffing of literacy programs.

Better perception of what literacy programs provide and their value to communities.

Q4 LVA-Sterling Municipal Library

Increasing number of adults with ESL needs.

Preserving a stable funding base for volunteer literacy programs.

Educating the public about how illiteracy affects everyone.

Establishing a linkage between library services and literacy services (how each benefits the other).

(Local government and community groups are now active proponents of literacy services; however, I don't see any real future leaders for literacy on the state/national level.)

Literacy Center, El Paso Public Library

Staffing - additional staff will be required for new lab.

Funding - for strengthening and updating collections.

Table GI, cont'd

Outreach - media campaign for public awareness and to recruit students.
Volunteers- for individualized instruction.
Curriculum development - for Hispanic populations.
Assessment - easy and affordable for student placement.
(Leadership: Local: Library Director, City Council, residents, BRLA. State: Legislators, TX State Library, Governor, TLA. National: Congressional leaders, Senator, President, ALA.)

Literacy Programs, Harris County Public Library
Libraries keeping pace with technology.
Funding for materials and technology.
Attracting diverse populations to the library.
Recognition of libraries as the infrastructure of education.
(Texas State Librarian, TX Library Association, TX State Library, knowledgeable legislators on state and national level.)

Andrews Adult Literacy Program, Andrews Public Library
Funding.
More trained teachers (paid). Volunteers really work out well, but many are limited in what they can do.
Legislators need more training—both local and state.

Utah

Q4 Bridgerland Literacy, Logan Library
Staff people, especially in outlying areas, need more training and staff development.
Programs would benefit from more effective instructional approaches.
More networking and coordination between programs is needed.
Stable, ongoing funding.

Vermont

Q2 In our state, the literacy people in general do not consider libraries as essential to fostering literacy. They consider them resource centers primarily and view programming as secondary or nonessential. Yet public libraries have sponsored a number of fine reading discussion programs and family literacy programs for new adult readers. They have set aside space for tutoring and developed small collections for students.

The literacy community in the state talks about the need to collaborate with other agencies but often leaves libraries out of the loop. It creates barriers by using acronyms and technical language non-educators do not understand or see reasons to use.

The best collaborations occur on a small scale and at a very local level. Some librarians have been frustrated by a lack of continuity and commitment on the part of individual tutors. They feel the managers promise increased tutor support but do not always follow through.

Virginia

Q4 Literacy Program, Newport News Public Library
The removal of blocked funding from the state. An increase of state funding would allow the literacy program to expand, as well as meet student needs with the necessary materials and resources.

Washington

Q2 Recognize library literacy programs as legitimate programs.
Coordinating with local literacy programs instead of competing.
Getting the smaller and medium-sized libraries aware of the literacy issues and enthusiastic about developing programs.
Convincing library directors that literacy should be addressed even though there are budget cuts.

Table G1, cont'd

Q4 Project READ, Longview Public Library

Family literacy needs to be strongly addressed.

All programs providing services to those in need should be educated in how literacy impacts what each is attempting to do.

Library Literacy Program/Lifelong Learning, Seattle Public Library

At Seattle Public Library, the future of literacy provision rests with the commitment of the board and the will of our city librarian. Currently there is a strong will.

We have to fit in with the existing literacy network as a collaborator, not an 800 lb. gorilla.

We have to educate our staff to best serve this new group of patrons.

We don't have enough space to provide the service we'd like.

(We will continue to work within SPL and the local literacy network to address these concerns.)

West Virginia

Q1 *(The media. Churches. Social agencies. Neighborhood improvement concerns. Local agents for change. Every strand in the community network.)*

Q2 Funding is the critical issue library literacy programs face. Libraries are notoriously underfunded. Library-based literacy programs would be difficult to maintain without funds earmarked for literacy.

Awareness is also an issue. Though problems of illiteracy have been brought to the public eye in recent years, many people do not view it as a problem that affects them personally. Increased awareness of the social and financial aspects of illiteracy may generate an interest in helping combat the problem.

Awareness that literacy efforts are not a short-term problem or goal. With the scope of the problem, as cited in the National Adult Literacy Survey (42% at the lowest 2 levels of literacy proficiency), this nation needs to commit to long-term solutions. With the literacy awareness efforts of First Ladies (Mrs. Bush and Ms. Rachel Woby, WV, and others) taking on the issue as part of their husbands' terms, I think the public may have thought the problem would disappear in 4-8 years. When several community groups were recently approached to assist in literacy efforts they responded that they already did that and thought the issue was resolved. Literacy will not be resolved as part of a campaign platform or a one-year community project. We must commit to lifelong learning. Early intervention would help at-risk children and adolescents and prevent the increasing number of illiterate adults. Programs where libraries and schools work together to assist in helping children achieve in school that start in the first grade and follow them through as needed is one example. Libraries have found that after school homework and/or tutoring sessions have been very successful. Across the state, a variety of programs are offered that include but are not limited to peer tutoring, resource sharing, tutoring, and any assistance as needed.

Training for tutors and trainers on a consistent basis. With the constant advances in discoveries in reading disabilities and the possible solutions or methods used, the trainers often feel out of date. However, the cost of attending training sessions nationally is very expensive and often impossible.

Q4 Literacy Program, Monroe County & Peterstown Public Libraries

Adequate and consistent funding.

(National leadership. WV Library Commission is very supportive but does not have funds.)

Wisconsin

Q1 Most important issue is acceptance and visibility of public libraries as literacy providers vis-a-vis other providers, so non-library providers will include libraries in their literacy planning and implementation. On both the national and state levels, there is a need to advocate the library's role. ***(U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Libraries and Museums, NCLIS, ALA, State Library)***

It would be ideal if libraries were guaranteed a percentage of literacy monies at both the national and state levels, albeit the overall monies would be administered by a different agency, so that interagency cooperation including libraries would be built into the system.

The other side of the coin is that national and state library leaders need to work continuously at the regional and local levels, helping to create connections at the grassroots level.

Again, the leadership should be provided by the groups listed above responsible for advocacy.

Table G1, cont'd

Q4 LVA Chippea Valley/Eau Claire, L.E. Phillips Memorial Public Library

Librarians need to realize libraries serve people who have survival needs not just those who read words. Library staff must become more global and embrace partnerships. With everyone looking for measurable outcomes we must work together.

Libraries are so governed by rules and regulations, it's difficult for them to see how they can [?] volunteer literacy programs. Perhaps a nationwide staff development project would educate staff about the needs of the adult learner and the trained volunteer.

recognize and support libraries as partners in education and literacy.

- Public libraries should be represented on all boards for literacy.

- Activities to educate Congress, governors, state commissioners, legislatures, and other political forces are vital.

- More partnerships should be forged between public libraries and the business communty, and between public libraries and community colleges.

- For that matter, businesses should provide more financial support for literacy, especially for the upgrading of their own underskilled workers. Their complaints are often not accompanied by action.

- The resolutions of the American Library Association, the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science (NCLIS), and other key national groups should give consistent attention to literacy.

- A nationwide library literacy staff development effort should be launched.

- Training is needed in how best to teach ESL students, the learning disabled, and other special populations.

- The role and effectiveness of volunteers and voluntary programs should be more widely and visibly recognized.

- A much stronger commitment at the state level is essential.

Responsibility For Leadership

A wide range of state and national groups are named as the appropriate entities to work with public libraries in providing leadership to preserve and develop the library's adult literacy service role.

Three groups of respondees (Q1, Q2, Q4) would place the heaviest responsibility on the following groups, roughly in the rank order shown: **The American Library Association...state libraries and state library associations...federal and state departments of education...the two major voluntary organizations (LVA and Laubach)...and governors, state legislatures, and other agencies of state government**.

Somewhat farther along in line are such groups as state literacy coalitions and SLRCs, state adult literacy offices, and the Center for the Book.

Also mentioned, though less frequently, the American Association of Adult and Continuing Education, NCLIS, the National Institute for Literacy, schools and colleges of library science, and the National Center for Family Literacy.

Community, regional, and national foundations are cited as well, as are the media and the President.

To Secure Adult Literacy In General: The SLRC Lens

In a separate question, SLRC heads were asked in G2 what half dozen or so issues they think most need attention at the national and state levels if *adult literacy services in general* are to be preserved and strengthened.

Like their library counterparts, SLRCs point primarily to several areas of established and obvious need: funding stability...more attention to family literacy... networking and collaboration...advocacy and information dissemination...documentation of successful activities... equal access to funding... more technology use... and other areas.

G2 ***If adult literacy services in your state are to be preserved and strengthened, what half dozen or so vital issues/problems do you think most need attention at the national and state levels? To whom would you most look for leadership in addressing these issues/problems? [Note: This question embraces all of adult literacy, not just library literacy services.]*** [Q3, SLRCs]

Q3 SLRCs (29 of 40, 73%)

Alaska
Make literacy one of the welfare priorities.
Guarantee minimum funding for literacy.
Increase computer use.
Provide more staff training.
Hire more full-time literacy instructors.

Arizona
Use funding for independent contractors more judiciously.
(U.S. Department of Education. In the state, the SEA Office of Adult Education and Literacy and GED Testing Services, SEA/ADE School-to-Work office, Governor's staff on school-to- \work, USDE, NIFL)

California
Develop national view of literacy that encompasses workforce but is not totally associated with jobs/work. See literacy as critical family issue with work one aspect.
Address all literacy in a "family literacy" context.
More involvement of adult learners in decision-making process.
(NIFL could lead the way!)

Colorado
A broader more humanistic philosophy or outlook on education, which encompasses and acknowledges the role of adult education.
A realization that there is no quick fix, and that job training/placement is not a substitute for basic skills training.
Respect and support of parents as role models and teachers, and as essential to children's successful literacy acquisition as the K-12 system.
Adult learners taken seriously as citizens, constituents, voters.

Hawaii
More coordination of resources.
More networking and cooperating.

Iowa
Awareness of the issue.
Stop allowing students to go through K-12 without obtaining literacy skills.
Require businesses to require literacy skills prior to employment.
Implement penalties for not achieving—i.e. no driver's license if you can't read.

Illinois
In Illinois we have built strong interagency support for literacy as the foundation for success for our residents. The uncertainty of funding in the future has made us look closely at how we work and how we can make the best use of our limited resources. We will be looking closely at technology and distance delivery systems supported through state and local resources which will bring information into all people in a community that can also benefit our literacy clients. The closer to home the funding can be, the more missions and policy match the needs in that home community. We all must make certain that there is an ongoing awareness of those needs and how all benefit from seeing that the needs are met.

Indiana
At the state level:
Produce a comprehensive biennial plan which coordinates literacy policy and program development.

But their responses also reflect a somewhat different perspective than that of the library groups, and are interesting for the texture they add to the hopper of sensible ideas to consider. For example,

- A wider perception of literacy must be developed that includes but is not so narrowly focused on jobs and work.

- Adult learners must become more involved in all decision making.

- Funding for independent contractors should be used more judiciously.

- Block grants and performance standards must not be allowed to kill services to the least educated. Without some effective intervention this is a very real danger.

- Economic and workforce development must be developed hand in hand for both to succeed.

- Regional coordinating councils might be looked to as useful planning and leadership mechanisms.

- Entrepreneurial activities should be encouraged at the local level.

- New ways of working will have to be found—with funding, missions, and policies developed closer to the community level.

- Penalties should be implemented for *not* achieving—e.g. if you can't read you won't be issued a driver's license.

A "QUICK-FIX" MENTALITY PERSISTS

One perspective imbedded in many of the responses to G1 and G2 is that adult basic education and literacy continues to be handicapped by a "quick-fix" mentality.

West Virginia's state library literacy professional speaks to this issue as follows:

[There must be wider] awareness that literacy efforts are not a short-term

Table G2, cont'd

Implement the state's biennial plan through regional coordinating councils to build a seamless learning system.
Encourage local programs to become more entrepreneurial.
Encourage private sector providers to co-locate with public sector providers.
Increase the capacity of co-located public-private sector initiatives to account for outcomes.
Encourage local programs to expand opportunities for individual tutorials to children.
Stimulate exchange of successful learning strategies between learning systems for adults and children.
[When giving grants to increase literacy skills,] give applicants as much latitude as possible in defining their proposal and funding needs, subject the proposal to a cost-benefit analysis, and negotiate the funding amount as needed.
Require each proposal to include volunteers as one component of the initiative.

Kansas
The literacy field must become more professional, accountable, and politically aware.
Literacy is only one aspect of adult education and, as with all education programs, should be led by professional educators.

Kentucky
Ensuring that adequate resources are available will continue to be an issue. With block grants and performance standards, the least educated, most in need may not be the priority target population for the limited resources. This will widen the gap between the "haves" and "have nots" in Kentucky. Economic development and workforce development must develop hand in hand for success of both initiatives. This problem needs attention at both the state and national levels. Typically each has struck out alone.

Louisiana
The priorities of the national leaders (Executive *and* Legislative Branches) drive the state leadership because of funds. The priorities of the next administration (within the state) will heavily impact the distribution of all block grant funds.

Michigan
Not sure.

Minnesota
They will need to show how they are utilizing existing resources and how they fit into the bigger picture (job training, welfare-to-work, family skills).

Missouri
Libraries are not major providers in our state. I think it will be easy to decrease funding to them. They have not reached out to local programs for the most part.

Mississippi
#1 problem will be access.
#2 problem will be communicating to both the Governor's office and the State Workforce Commission the significant role libraries play in our state.

Montana
Going up against a much better organized education establishment.

North Carolina
Don't know.

North Dakota
It's difficult to speculate at this time.

Nebraska NE
This sense of "competition" is indeed a major concern. However, what I would most like to see are programs—including library literacy—joining forces, pooling resources (including $), and ceasing the fight for dollars. If we continue, though, to think only in terms of "my"

problem or goal. With the scope of the problem, as cited in the National Adult Literacy Survey...this nation needs to commit to long-term solutions.

With [Mrs. Bush and...state-level first ladies] taking on the issue as part of their husbands' terms... the public may have thought the problem would disappear in [a few] years ...[but] literacy will not be resolved as part of a campaign platform or a one-year community project.

Table G2, cont'd

program , or "our" program, this kind of competition will continue. Libraries do need to be a part of any workforce development boards or planning for statewide initiatives. So do the SLRCs!

New Hampshire
Competition for funds will be intense.

New Mexico
In NM these projects are able to compete well with other local literacy projects.

Oklahoma
Probably increased administrative and managerial demands on reduced staff.

Pennsylvania
Ensure that literacy resources are made available to service providers and adult students. *(State Education Department)* As "block grant" funds are identified for adult education, line item(s) for library resources should be included.

South Carolina
They will get the "short end of the stick." Their lobbying group is not as strong in SC as the adult education group.

South Dakota
Will depend on plan that would be provided by Governor's office.

Utah
Reality: 6 wolves in a pen and only food for 3.

Vermont
n/a.

Virginia
Library personnel have to be proactive, have initiative in building bridges. This is a situation people in AE and literacy also face; it is important to see themselves as a working part and essential component to a whole, to put aside turf battles and insularity because only by seeing they need each other can they hope to survive.

Washington
Library literacy undoubtedly will not be funded out of the Workforce Development Act block grant. However, libraries in Washington currently receive little or no literacy funding beyond LSCA.

Wisconsin
State education agencies are not necessarily the ones which will be in control. Library personnel are not alone in their concerns.

West Virginia
We are all worried about drastic cuts in funding, especially in trying to document "human relations" gains such as improvements in self-esteem, etc.

WE NEED NATIONAL LEADERSHIP — AND FUNDING FOR IT

It is also worth observing that even though economic and political pressures will force state and local groups of all kinds to fend for themselves more in the future, there is no substitute for strong national leadership.

Without it, it would be impossible to truly avoid duplication of services...or synthesize and apply what is known from national and world experience about good practice...or create good state and national policy...or advance citizenship and learning with reference to the common goals that hold a nation together.

To put it in more practical terms, it isn't hard to see that the many planning and technical assistance services that national organizations provide to their members —the relationship of the national voluntary organizations to their affiliate programs is a perfect example—are an essential lifeline to the local groups, even to groups in the most isolated locations.

Yet national groups have always had great difficulty getting the funding they need for core services because funders see "technical assistance" as dull and vague and less immediately rewarding than direct instruction. But for local groups to be effective (and often state groups for that matter), they need the nurturing and information services of comprehensive one-stop national entities.

As national organizations themselves struggle against great financial odds, they should be heartened that most of the individuals surveyed in this study clearly recognize, value, and need them.

More Ideas For The Hopper

In G 3, state library literacy contacts and SLRC heads were asked to speculate on the type of state-level or national help *local library literacy programs themselves* could most benefit from.

About a third of the study participants did not respond to the question at all, suggesting considerable uncertainty about local needs. But from

G3. What state-level or national assistance not now provided to local library literacy programs in your state do you think the programs would most benefit from? What strategies/projects can you suggest for developing the assistance they need? [Q2, Q3]

Q2 State Library Literacy Contacts (25 of 44, 57%)
Q3 SLRCs (27 of 40, 68%)

Alaska

Q2 Libraries in Alaska, as elsewhere, have had to cut back in many areas after the "boom years" when funding was strong. Good intentions for literacy programming have succumbed to trying to maintain some level of basic services. Unless a new, stable source of revenue is found, libraries are unlikely to take on new programs.

Space is also a problem: many libraries in Alaska were built with oil money and are now crowded and in need of repair, with no relief in sight.

Q3 Channel funds through existing literacy network of 20 regional providers.

Alabama

Q3 At the national level you need to be a stronger advocate for networking. Stop funding so many entities. You are creating and currently advocating duplication of services.

Arkansas

Q2 Increased cooperation with activities between other adult education providers and local public libraries.

Provision of more cooperative funding opportunities on federal level for public libraries and other literacy agencies.

California

Q2 Funding for library literacy services (increased).

Q3 Statewide library literacy newsletter (quarterly).

Publication (regular) of abstracts of successful library literacy programs.

Colorado

Q2 No opinion.

Q3 They currently receive technical assistance from our office of adult education. If federal funds are lost, they will need state/local support.

Connecticut

Q3 Funding directly to programs or for the establishment of new programs based on existing successful models.

Delaware

Q2 Our libraries rank low nationally and we are striving to develop basic services. Hopefully, literacy will receive more attention once our libraries receive more support.

Florida

Q2 A mechanism is needed to determine the long-term impact tutoring/program support provided by libraries make in the lives of those served/tutored once they leave the program (e.g. percent that go on to pass GED, get a trade or continue in college, get a degree, become employable).

Also needed is a national tracking system that provides feedback.

Hawaii

Q3 Family literacy.

Training and technology.

Table G3, cont'd

Illinois	Q2	In light of the coming changes which block granting might bring, I suggest they will need assistance with resource development either through coordination with other agencies or through other sources such as foundations, Friends of the Library groups, civic organizatons, etc.
	Q3	I would like to see ILA and ALA more active in promoting and sponsoring training for librarians in effective literacy efforts and partnerships. I realize that there have been some attempts such as the ILA and Head Start video, but there's much more that could be done. We also need to promote literacy in libraries through the local communities which support public libraries. School libraries could also play a significant role in literacy. Our experience indicates that libraries sometimes don't have a clear understanding of what they can do in literacy.
Indiana	Q2	Help to determine what works, successful practices, model coalition, technology. Public education and public relations. More literacy student involvement in planning. Continued cooperation between organizations at the national and state level.
	Q3	Need stable revenue stream. Become more entrepreneurial and approach business committee about what it needs (Kevin Kostner's Friends of Dreams approach doesn't work well).
Iowa	Q3	Electronic hook-up.
Kentucky	Q2	Data collecltion. Distribution of information.
	Q3	Funds and curriculum for technology and technology training. Continue Title VI funding. More policy and supervisory support for library literacy personnel. Consolidate literacy funding from all sources to single source.
Louisiana	Q3	Federal - Title IV. LEH funds depend upon NEH funds. Given the current climate, I do not know what strategies might be effective.
Massachusetts	Q2	We really hear little directly from the ALA or from COSLA. A lot of the literacy activities are promoted from this agency outward to the public libraries and at an interagency level. We need to teach state agencies to do both horizontal and vertical collaboration (see Nickse-Quezada *Community Collaborations for Family Literacy Handbook*).
Maine	Q2	More funding to assist program development. Targeting special interest volunteers (Friends etc.) to assist in setting up programs, services, places to tutor, and materials in libraries. Strategic planning sessions on a local level. This needs to be a grassroots project but the state library can provide facilitators.
Michigan	Q3	Marketing to maintain literacy as a national focus. Individual entities do not have resources or expertise to keep issue alive over time.

the two-thirds that did respond, there is an interesting mix of ideas to consider, though many are next-step ideas for the field generally rather than suggestions to directly help local programs:

- Space is a problem. Many libraries in Alaska were built with oil money and are in need of repair, with no relief in sight. (Q2, AK)

- A statewide library literacy newsletter...and regularly published abstracts of successful library literacy programs [would be helpful]. (Q3, CA)

- A mechanism is needed to determine the long-term impact that library literacy programs make in the lives of those served after they leave the program. What is needed is the development of a national tracking system that provides regular feedback. (Q2, FL)

- The ILA and ALA should become more active in promoting and sponsoring training for librarians in how to work effectively in literacy. There have been some attempts but...much more could be done. Our experience indicates that libraries sometimes don't have a clear understanding of what they can do in literacy. (Q3, IL)

◆ We hear little directly from the ALA or COSLA (Chief Officers of State Library Agencies)... [but their help is needed] in activities to teach state agencies to do both horizontal and vertical collaboration. (Q2, MA)

◆ Strategic planning sessions on a local level are needed. This needs to be a grassroots project but the state library can provide facilitators. (Q2, ME)

◆ Wage-based programs are needed because the present reliance on volunteers is excessive and unsustainable. (Q2-NE, Q2-TX)

◆ More detailed information about library literacy programs around the country would be helpful. E-mail addresses of online library literacy programs would also help. (Q2, NH)

◆ Develop library literacy leaders through a national training institute similar to the ALA Intellectual Freedom Leadership

Table G3, cont'd

Minnesota		
	Q3	Funding assistance and better ways for linking with existing programs. Chances are that somebody, somewhere has done what you want to do. Facilitating some collaboration or just resource sharing is critical. More funding for the SLRCs would help. That (is) was part of the SLRC mission as set out in the National Literacy Act—to facilitate collaboration and resource sharing. In our case, our SLRC never got a chance to get going.
Missouri		
	Q2	Targeted library literacy resources including speakers, resource materials, and lobbying information.
	Q3	The libraries need to become part of local programs, but ABE programs do not include them in their partnerships. Our SLRC is trying to develop closer links with libraries. Family literacy programs have formed better relationships with libraries.
Mississippis		
	Q2	The development of family literacy programs. Raising community awareness of the value in providing family literacy programs. Family literacy needs are being addressed in two ways in the state: (a) Some libraries in the state participated in the Viburnum/ALA Rural Family Literacy Workshop and are seeking funds through the project to conduct family literacy projects in their communities. (b) The Mississippi Library Commission has committed approximately $75,000 to assist public libraries in enhancing and developing library programs directed toward young children at risk.
	Q3	Develop models that will strongly link the programs to both the State Workforce Council and schools.
Montana		
	Q3	Stronger connection among the programs—meetings, electronic, etc.
Nebraska		
	Q2	A wage-based program (presently volunteer-based). Continuance of the University Clearinghouse.
	Q3	State: Assistance in terms of establishing cooperative relationships, enhancing awareness of other programs and opportunities within each community for learners. Because of their position within most states, the SLRCs are well-positioned to provide this function; however, it also demands a commitment from the state in terms of carrying this out. National: There is much that could be done within this same area in terms of providing the library commission and local libraries with specific information on how to cultivate such cooperative relationships.
New Hampshire		
	Q2	More detailed information about library literacy programs around the country, for networking and sharing. E-mail addresses of other online library literacy programs. Student and tutor "chats" or "pen-pals" online. Perhaps a voluntary questionnaire about programming to other library literacy programs.
	Q3	Continued funding would add to the stability and long-term planning for these programs.
New Jersey,		
	Q3	Generating awareness of library staff to benefit involvement in literacy movement.
New York		
	Q2	Statewide conferencing. Technical assistance. Data collection and analysis.

Table G3, cont'd

North Dakota	Q2	Training students/trainers in use of technology to develop literacy skills.
	Q3	Training for state library personnel in understanding their role in the literacy movement.
Ohio	Q2	We are working with other agencies that provide literacy support. I have been assigned to "literacy" within the last year and am still making contacts. I will continue to work with them to support cooperative projects.
Oklahoma	Q2	Better networking between each other, other states, and national resources. Computer access and training may encourage better communication. Stable funding for library-based literacy programs. It is hard to operate any program, much less volunteer programs, with such uncertain funding. National awareness and promotion of library literacy programs would be very beneficial.
Oregon	Q2	Develop library literacy leaders through a national training institute similar to the ALA Intellectual Freedom Leadership Institute. A train-the-trainers approach could help spread the message back in the states. The passion for literacy services must be extended.
Pennsylvania	Q2	Assistance is provided through the Pennsylvania Department of Education's Bureau of Adult Basic and Literacy Education.
South Carolina	Q2	A clearer focus on what library literacy programs are in relation to formal educational efforts. Public libraries often do not receive credit for their efforts.
	Q3	The continued funding for SLRCs to assure the continued access to the latest materials for the new reader and the literacy tutor.
Texas	Q2	Clearinghouse and/or assistance programs that bring together licracy providers to share materials, evaluation, and knowledge. Funding for materials, equipment, and staff. Cannot depend on volunteers much longer. Long-term financial support.
Utah	Q3	Consult librarians. Discussion.
Vermont	Q2	Funds to develop collections and purchase technology for self-instruction as well as funds to coordinate community collaboration.
	Q3	New reader awareness—break stereotypes. Need information on materials and promotion of materials for new readers.
Virginia	Q3	Leadership that is visible, action-oriented, and able to initiate working partnerships with adult education and literacy programs (public and private). Give library personnel "release time" to attend adult education and literacy workshops that will facilitate developing skills and knowledge in helping adult learners.

I was pleased to see that there was a general perception that the national role for advocacy and information dissemination was felt as important. This area has had little study and is important for national organizations because we often receive little feedback and it is difficult to fund this aspect of our work. The general appreciation and support for national literacy efforts was surprising as well as reassuring. (Peter Waite, Laubach Literacy Action)

Institute. A train-the-trainers approach could help spread the message back to the states. (Q2, OR)

◆ Give library personnel "release time" to attend adult education and literacy workshops. (Q3, VA)

BEYOND THE SURVEY: LOCAL PROGRAMS GET THE LAST WORD

The very last survey question invited local library literacy programs to indicate any issues or concerns of special importance to them that were not addressed in the study. Some 25% of the programs took advantage of the opportunity.

Although the resulting table (G 4), which is very short, ought to be read in its entirety, this section of the report will conclude by spotlighting, with only minor editing, a few of the responses. They are heartfelt, honest, and filled with understanding and commitment. They "say it like it is" and are a challenge to us all:

◆ As funds have been allocated for adult training, libraries are usually not considered or even thought of as a source. When job skills were mandated for food stamp recipients, the college's ABE program was given the contract. Our program could and would serve these clients, but the library was not contacted. (Mesa County Public Library, CO)

◆ Because adults

Table G3, cont'd

What is obvious of course is: more funds to support their literacy work!!!

West Virginia

Q2 Training. Awareness campaign. Funding!!!

Q3 The LSCA Title VI grant is now gone. It was extremely helpful before in providing materials and software.

Wisconsin

Q3 State and national funding should find ways to allow and facilitate collaborative planning and delivery of services.

Wyoming

Q2 LSCA Title VI helped several library literacy programs in the past.

G4. If an issue or concern of special importance to you has been overlooked in this questionnaire, please feel free to discuss it here. [Q4 only]

Q4 Local Programs (16 of 63, 25%)

AR Adequate training to work with minorities. *(AR River Valley Libraries for Literacy - Reading Together, AR River Valley Regional Library)*

CA Need to raise awareness of connection between learning disabilities and low literacy skills. Literacy providers/organizations tend to favor whole language approach, which is not effective with many dyslexic adults. We are training our tutors to work with dyslexic individuals. However, this has required specialized training for our staff and intensive monitoring of tutors. Making this commitment means we can serve fewer individuals at one time. However, we feel that we are providing better service, and we can demonstrate greater accountability. National ALLD Center is doing a great job disseminating information, but there needs to be more advocacy for learners with LDs. *(Partners in Reading, San Jose Public Library)*

CO As funds have been allocated for adult training, libraries are usually not considered or even thought of as a source. When job skills were mandated for food stamp recipients, the college's ABE program was given the contract. Our program could and would serve these clients, but the library was not contacted. However, I must add that most libraries don't see literacy service as a primary part of their mission, thus taking themselves out of the circle. *(Literacy Program, Mesa County Public Library District)*

FL If libraries take a position of decreased support of literacy programs, it is sending a message that they will implicitly not provide access to at least 20%of the population (see National Literacy Survey). This is inconsistent with other outreach efforts to special groups (seniors, youth, minorities, et al). *(Hillsborough Literacy Council, Tampa-Hillsborough County Library System)*

IL Literacy providers need to be more proactive. Just because we use volunteers [doesn't mean we're not] a very professional agency. Some libraries (not ours) view literacy as a bother. *(Libraries for Literacy in Lake County, Waukegan Public Library)*

MA Because adults seeking literacy instruction keep a very low profile, they are not visible or vocal. This is a population without a voice. With the rise in technology

Table G4, cont'd

and its pervasiveness in the workforce, they have to contend with a tremendous barrier to accessing information. With low job opportunity, low literacy skills, inability to access information through print or computer technology, will anything ever change for them quickly enough to effect a difference for themselves and their families? *(Literacy Program, Thomas Crane Public Library)*

MI Share your analysis of these surveys with all state literacy agencies and state departments of education, [and] with education committees in the federal legislative arena, the President, and Congress. *(MARC Literacy Program, Greenville Public Library)*

MN Libraries are more than stored memories! They are increasingly becoming community centers and this should be supported/celebrated. Libraries have been heralds to immigrants/new readers. They still can be, but some seem prone to confusion about their roles. *(Franklin Learning Center, Franklin Community Library, Minneapolis Public Library)*

MN Because Minnesota has a strong collaborative of literacy services and support groups our perspective can be very different from a state that does not have this structure and the local library is the literacy service provider. *(Linking Libraries & Literacy for Lifelong Learning, Lexington Branch Library, St. Paul)*

NE Availability of stable funding has always been a concern of nonprofit organizations. Most private foundations do not want to fund ongoing programs or salaries for staff. At the current time, 50% of our funding is through the Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA VI). We feel we have a vital, well-organized adult education and tutoring program; yet, from year to year, it is difficult to find funding. The LSCA grant has traditionally covered salaries and materials. There must be recognition at the state or local level that adult literacy programs must be given at least partial stable funding, so we can continue providing adults and their children literacy skills. *(Platte Valley Literacy Association, Columbus Public Library)*

NJ Assessment programs for basic math and tutor training videos and materials for math tutors would be helpful. *(Basic Skills for Reading & ESL, Elizabeth Public Library)*

NY There is evidence that the functional illiteracy of many American adults may have a severe effect on our economic health. Yet, even if jobs were available, if they can't read well enough they can't work those jobs. Adult education, which is not a part of public education anymore, seems to have become a stepchild of library services which for the most part are underfunded in New York State. The public schools used to conduct adult basic education, ESL, etc. Now it seems to be up to agencies such as PIC, literacy groups such as LLA and LVA. I am hoping that block grants to the state will make public education more accountable and that out of monies designated for public education there will be a set amount for libraries that libraries can count on especially if they are to take over the role of adult education. *(Library Literacy Center of Prendergast Library, Jamestown)*

OR The importance of basic language and math skills to our economy is about to be diminished in the frantic quest for a quick fix in work-related skills programs. If we don't help those with minimum skills get to the level where they can enter job training, society will have to support them in one way or another. *(LEARN Project, Eugene Public Library)*

PA The National Adult Literacy Survey of 1993 received only a split second of media attention, but it was the most far-reaching survey of adult literacy in the U.S. This survey seems to have been forgotten, but it found that 90 million adults lack the literacy skills necessary to function in today's world. This survey points to a national crisis which seems to have been overlooked and forgotten by many. *(Bradford-Wyoming County Literacy Program, Bradford County Library)*

seeking literacy instruction keep a low profile, they are not visible or vocal. This is a population without a voice. With the rise in technology and its pervasiveness in the workforce, they have to contend with a tremendous barrier to accessing information. With low job opportunity, low literacy skills, inability to access information through print or computer technology, will things change for them quickly enough to make a difference for themselves and their families? (Thomas Crane Public Library, MA)

◆ Libraries are more than stored memories! They are increasingly becoming community centers and this should be supported and celebrated. Libraries have been heralds to immigrants and new readers. They still can be, but some seem prone to confusion about their roles. (Minneapolis Public Library, MN)

◆ The National Adult Literacy Survey of 1993 received only a split second of media attention, but it was the most far-reaching survey of adult literacy in the U.S. This survey seems to have been

Table G4, cont'd

TX	My concern is meeting the needs of a primarily Hispanic population, many of the students served are illiterate in their native language and it is difficult to find appropriate materials for native language literacy instruction. *(Literacy Center, El Paso Public Library)*
UT	Libraries should be in the business of providing services to all of their patrons, not just the literate population. As our society becomes more diverse and access to information becomes more critical, libraries have a responsibility to enhance or sponsor literacy efforts. [Also], focus groups have revealed that our students value computer instruction alongside their literacy instruction. Childcare and work schedules often interfere with participation. We need to respond better to childcare and transportation needs. *(Bridgerland Literacy, Logan Library)*

forgotten, but it points to a national crisis. (Bradford County Library, PA)

◆ The importance of basic language and math skills to our economy is about to be diminished in the frantic quest for a quick fix in work-related skills programs. If we don't help those with minimum skills get to the level where they can enter job training, society will have to support them in one way or another. (Eugene Public Library, OR)

◆ Libraries should be in the business of providing services to all of their patrons, not just the literate population. As our society becomes more diverse and access to information becomes more critical, libraries have a responsibility to enhance or sponsor literacy efforts. (Logan Library, UT)

8. CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

Public libraries are an important mainstay of American life, with some 15,000 central and branch facilities spread across this nation. They have a long, proud tradition of community and educational service.

Judging by what the participants of this survey say, and by the large number of public libraries now involved in the provision of adult literacy service (some 7,000 not counting branches), public libraries also embrace adult literacy service as a central part of their ongoing mission, although with occasional ambivalence. They are a community anchor for literacy —or as one project advisor put it, they could well be seen as "the irreducible backbone of the literacy movement."

Throughout the country —in state library agencies, state literacy resource centers, local library literacy programs, and among state librarians themselves— examples of committed and inspired leadership abound. These bright lights are well worth celebrating in their own right and should never be lost sight of in the national averaging and analyses that make up most of this report.

However, the study is about problems and possibilites, and, as it turns out, about the fraying lifeline that presently links public libraries to adult literacy. As the title of this report proclaims, this lifeline needs to be reinforced as a matter of grave urgency.

Otherwise, hundreds of thousands of poorly skilled adult Americans being helped to improve those skills every year by public libraries—and by public libraries *alone*—could lose their best hope for achieving their full potential as workers, parents, and citizens. And vast numbers of public library adult literacy programs —including affiliates of Literacy Volunteers of America and Laubach Literacy Action that are housed in public libraries— will be forced to severely curtail their operations or close down altogether.

Ironically, just as public library literacy programs have become an established part of the adult literacy system, they find themselves in terrible jeopardy. They are being squeezed by diminished funding for adult literacy generally, threats that federal library literacy funding will not be available in any form in the near future, and reduced state library budgets.

It is hoped that those now in positions of leadership—and those who *could* be—will read the findings and recommendations presented below with an eye toward what new roles they can assume.

Among those in the best position to accept the challenge are the American Library Association, the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, state libraries and library associations, federal and state departments of education, the National Institute for Literacy, the National Coalition for Literacy, Literacy Volunteers of America, Laubach Literacy, governors, state literacy resource centers (SLRCs), university-based literacy institutes, the Center for the Book, the philanthropic community——and there are many others, including the President and members of Congress.

Even Anchors Need Lifelines is full of more ideas, findings, and suggested remedies than can possibly be explored fully in one short document. But this report has been designed as a resource that can have a life well into the future—in the coming discussions, meetings, and studies of all who care about adult literacy and the role of public libraries.

In the meantime, the report's main findings are given below, followed by 19 recommendations (on pp. 121-125) for preserving and developing the public library role.

~ ROLE ~

✔ **1** When it comes to providing adult literacy services, public libraries play a unique, substantial, and cost-effective role that is vastly beneficial to all parties involved. But their role has not yet been clearly enough defined, which handicaps advocacy, funding, and policy development.

✔ **2.** Some 70% of state library personnel surveyed believe that adult literacy services should be a *major* public library mission. (Many of the others are either unsure or think the role should be less than major.) Moreover, the vast majority of *all* respondents think adult literacy should be even more important to public libraries in the future.

✔ **3.** Despite their strong, even passionate, belief in adult literacy, only 50% of state libraries currently have a major adult literacy involvement. Lack of funding at the state and federal levels is the basic reason for the discrepancy between what state libraries *say* about the importance of their adult literacy role and what they *do*. Without external funding help, the situation is certain to worsen, especially as the state agencies struggle to preserve their core operating budgets.

✔ **4.** Communication is poor among state library personnel, the SLRCs, and local library literacy programs.

✔ **5.** State librarians, and librarians generally, are too little involved in state and national literacy planning.

✔ **6.** Librarians, traditional adult educators, state and national legislative entities, and funders have a limited understanding of the important public library role in providing adult literacy services. Yet the policy and funding actions of these very groups most affect libraries *and* literacy.

✔ **7.** Tension, mistrust, and occasional hostility between education and library agencies makes cooperative planning difficult. Traditional educators often do not recognize or accept the educational role of public libraries. Tendencies to protect turf need to give way to cooperation and mutual respect.

~ TECHNOLOGY ~

✔ **1.** In general, public library literacy personnel strongly favor the increased use of computers in their institutions and programs.

✔ **2.** Local library literacy programs make heavy use of computer technology now, but they are hesitant to increase that use while struggling to keep their very programs alive.

✔ **3.** Interest is high in using distance learning technology for library literacy purposes—understood by most respondents to be computer, Internet, and World Wide Web information technology. There appears to be only moderate understanding of the potential of the instructional broadcast media as traditionally defined, despite the tremendous potential of this vast undertapped resource.

There is no shared agreement about the role of library literacy service from any umbrella organization. Professional organizations such as the IRA...have taken leadership in setting standards for English and language arts throughout the country. Perhaps the ALA could take the lead for literacy. (Diane Rosenthal, NY)

This report shows a tremendous need to debate, and to [better document] the benefits...of libraries as education/literacy service providers. (Barbara Humes, OERI)

✔ **4.** Even if local programs had the funds to invest in more technology, the information they need about good models in use by their peers is in very short supply.

✔ **5.** If they must choose one or the other, state library agencies are more interested in technology for the purpose of expanding their general public information services than for its use as an adult literacy tool. In many cases, technology would have to be in place for general purposes before it could be put into adult literacy service.

✔ **6.** The greatest obstacle to wider technology use among all groups surveyed is a critical lack of funding to purchase hardware and software, and to develop trained staff to support them.

✔ **7.** Technology can help improve instruction and information management, but it can also destroy important human values and sap the core services of underfunded local library literacy programs.

~ PLANNNG ~

✔ **1.** Most states have a statewide literacy planning body of some kind. Most state library agencies are involved in that planning, although, with a few exceptions, they do not have a strong voice.

✔ **2.** SLRCs are presently the main source of planning and resource development help to libraries and other literacy stakeholders at the state level.

✔ **3.** With some remarkable exceptions, SLRCs have been badly implemented and financially starved. Many have been forced to close or severely cut back their services because federal funding for them ceased in FY95. Without a restoration of funding, many others will not long survive or remain effective. Their death or crippling would deprive state libraries and other groups of a vital source of information and technical assistance—at a time when it is most needed.

✔ **4.** SLRCs (and the state departments of education in which many are lodged) have weak working relations with the American Library Association and other state and national library professional groups that are interested or engaged in adult literacy.

✔ **5.** Similarly, state libraries have generally weak working relations with key national organizations that shape overall adult literacy policy and funding.

> In Tennessee we have worked very well with state level staff, but still find it a bit difficult to "convince" local providers, both library and adult education, of the advisability of being very collaborative with each other. (Nancy Weatherman, TN)

✔ **6.** Public libraries need the help of national organizations to develop informational materials...carry out awareness and planning activities...and devise strategies for program coordination and collaboration.

~ FINANCES-FUNDING ~

✔ **1.** More than 50% of state libraries provided some local library literacy funding in FY95, including many who do not consider adult literacy services a major part of their mission. But, in most cases the funding was minimal, ranging from $4,000 to $70,000. Only seven state libraries provided a six-figure amount (between $100,000-$385,000). California and Illinois, in a class by themselves, provided $3,466,000 and $6,000,000 respectively. Furthermore, federal LSCA funds, rather than allocations from the core library budget, accounted for much of the state library funding.

> Cooperation, collaboration, and partnerships between the local literacy program and other literacy and education programs is the key—not competition and duplication of effort.. Collaboration between the local library literacy programs and the rest of the library is also essential. (Judy Stark, OERI)

✔ **2.** Permanent loss of federal funds for library literacy or a shift to block grants without earmarks specifically for library literacy would force most programs to cut deeply into the muscle of their services. Even worse, many would be unable to survive. Few respondents believe replacement funding could be found.

✔ **3.** Public libraries need the help of national literacy and library organizations to restore lost funding and develop additional funding and more funding stability.

~ STATE-LEVEL PROGRAM DATA ~

✔ **1.** With a few exceptions, state libraries do not regularly collect data on local public library literacy activities, and neither do any other groups. This void undercuts the efforts of state libraries and others working to advance library literacy.

✔ **2.** There is a crying need for consistent and comparable data collection at the state and national levels. Data kept according to the population service area categories in use by the National Center for Educational Statistics would be especially useful. Fortunately, there are a few truly extraordinary models of effective leadership on this front—the state libraries in Illinois, Massachusetts, Florida, and California, for example—from which others could learn.

✔ **3.** Although their role is not fully recognized, public libraries are a vital component of the country's adult literacy delivery system. Without counting individual branch operations, an estimated 2,000+ local public libraries nationwide have a major involvement in providing adult literacy services today. An additional 5,700 are involved to some degree.

> The most alarming part of the survey findings is the minimal level of state funding for literacy programs throughout the country. (Dan Boyd, SD)

✔ **4.** State library funding for literacy is heavily dependent on federal LSCA grants. Much of it will evaporate if federal funding is not restored or if block grants are not earmarked for state libraries and library literacy.

✔ **5.** Although state libraries give little direct funding to local library literacy programs, they give many other important services—at a substantial cost.

~ LOCAL PROGRAMS ~

✔ **1. Who and What They Are:** Local library literacy programs are a mix of LVA, Laubach, and eclectic programs. Some are outside entities housed in public libraries, others are directly operated by the library. They rely heavily on volunteers, focus on one-to-one and small group instruction, tend to be based on whole language principles, and follow flexible teaching methods geared to the life needs of their adult learners. Their fundamental purpose is to provide help to the most poorly skilled adults (who are not served by traditional school or ABE programs), enabling them to acquire the basic reading, writing, math, and ESL proficiency needed to advance to higher-level educational programs and achieve their personally-determined functional goals.

✔ **2. Their Students:** In FY95, of the 53,000 students served by the sampling of programs in this study, 32% were Hispanic, 23% were Black. Some 36% were unemployed, and 50% were in the workforce either part- or full-time. 93% were between the ages of 17 and 59. The gender balance was 45% male and 55% female. A disproportionately high percentage were on public assistance and were high school noncompleters.

✔ **3. Their Reliance on Federal Funding**. 75% of the programs (chosen for this study because of their longevity and solid track records) have been in operation 10 years or less, One thing that surprised me (although I knew it intellectually) was just how different the situations are in individual states. It seems like block grants will create very uneven services from state to state. The data from these surveys really emphasized that for me. Overall this is a bad thing. It will make programs very political and could increase program favoritism (a comment made often by the respondents). (Virginia Heinrich, MN)

corresponding to the 10-year period in which LSCA Title VI grants were made. Only 21% pre-date 1983 and the launching of the adult literacy movement as a whole. In the fall of 1995, 65% of all the programs had some federal funding, with federal LSCA grants accounting for 40% of their total funding (and state funding only 10%.) The permanent withdrawal of federal funds or unearmarked state block grant funding would be disastrous for the local programs.

✔ **4. Their Low Cost.** Library literacy programs operate with very small staffs and limited budgets. They are truly one of the country's great educational bargains. In FY95 all programs in this study averaged 1 full-time staff member for every 390 students, 1 paid staff member for every 172 students, 1 volunteer tutor for every 8 students, and a per-student cost of $107.

✔ **5. Their Service To Working Adults.** Some 25% of the programs surveyed regularly serve part- and full-time workers. Crippling the library-based delivery system would thus have an adverse impact on workforce and workplace literacy.

✔ **6.** State library agencies are not the dominant source of technical and planning help to local programs but they are a highly important source. If the SLRC role keeps shrinking, state libraries may need to pick up the slack.

There have to be some leadership activities. The Center for the Book would provide ideal auspices for some, but there are others. To get started, the activities required need not cost very much.

Being willing to put up funding for leadership is a test of whether anybody really cares about the programs.
(Forrest Chisman, SIPA)

✔ **7.** Adult literacy programs experience three main problems because they operate in a library culture: trouble competing for local education funds... widespread salary inequities... and low status in the eyes of other library personnel.

✔ **8.** The library culture is beneficial to adult literacy programs in many ways. For example, an immense variety of free resources... an inviting, stigma-free setting...great flexibility because the programs are not arbitrarily held to inappropriate regulations designed for traditional education...a natural path to volunteers in the community...and a highly supportive natural environment for families.

~ LIFEBLOOD ISSUES & LEADERSHIP ~

✔ **1.** For adult literacy services in public libraries to survive and thrive, bold state and national leadership is essential. Funding for that leadership is also essential.

✔ **2.** The field is still handicapped by a "quick fix" mentality. Upgrading adult basic skills takes time. ■

Throw down the gauntlet and challenge The Center for the Book/Library of Congress, the American Library Association, and others (e.g. foundations like Lilly and MacArthur) to help. (Shelley Quezada, MA)

The Center for the Book, LVA, Laubach, and the National Institute for Literacy could come together as a dynamic advocate for community-based library literacy programs by communicating to our legislators that literacy is accomplished one by one and that learning takes time.

We shouldn't abandon the programs now that the infrastructure is established in many parts of the country. (Virginia Schantz, MI)

~ RECOMMENDATIONS ~

The single most urgent issue identified in this report is the dire need for funds and funding stability. In fact, funding may well be the defining issue for the future of public libraries in adult literacy. Recommendations #1 and #2 are addressed to this life-and-death matter.

RECOMMENDATION #1:

Earmarked funding in a significant dollar amount needs to be restored for library literacy programming—at the federal level, in state block grants, or both.

This should be done to prevent a major implosion of the field. It can be achieved most quickly through federal and state legislation. The extreme urgency of this matter needs to be conveyed immediately to Congress and to state legislators and governors. It is vital to keep in mind that voluntary organizations, community-based organizations, and adults across the country have as much at stake as public libraries have.

Individually and in joint actions, the following groups need to speak out: national adult literacy leaders from across the spectrum of private and public interests...committed state librarians and commissioners...the American Library Association...the National Institute for Literacy...the Office of Educational Research and Improvement...the Office of Vocational and Adult Education...the Chief Officers of State Library Agencies...Literacy Volunteers of America...Laubach Literacy Action...the Association for Community Based Education...the National Coalition for Literacy...and any other group whose voice could make a difference and who will be affected by the outcome.

Local library literacy personnel need to speak out as well.

RECOMMENDATION #2:

The philanthropic community should offer immediate help. It would make a profound difference.

The new three-year grant initiative of the Lila Wallace-Readers' Digest Fund is a very bright light on a dark horizon. But, in the present situation, responsiveness is needed from other foundations as well.

Foundations can often move more quickly than government bureaucracies, and it would be in their best tradition if several responded to this call to action. The Kellogg and MacArthur Foundations, and the Ford, Lilly, and Mott Foundations, are all examples.

Funds placed in the hands of the ALA and/or state library agencies themselves might be used in the first instance to help local library literacy programs keep their balance while time is taken to develop thoughtful long-range plans.

RECOMMENDATION #3:

Assuming that federal and/or state library literacy funding will be forthcoming, consideration should be given to officially designating state library agencies the lead state agencies for planning and developing local public library adult literacy programming.

Even though state library involvement in adult literacy varies from state to state now, there is substantial experience and a very strong state library interest on which to build.

As part of this official leadership role, the agencies should be given fiscal and administrative responsibility. To be effective they would need to consult regularly with other state agencies, especially education and literacy groups. They would also need to consult with each other, through COSLA and other ongoing forums.

Guidelines would probably need to be written into federal and/or state law to assure an equitable redistribution of the funds to local libraries for their literacy programs.

This recommendation may need considerable refinement given the politics involved and structural differences in the organization of education and library services from state to state. But without funding and real opportunity to "buy-in," it is hard to see how even the most willing state libraries can take a wider leadership role than they now have.

RECOMMENDATION #4:

Form a national planning alliance.

Membership should include state libraries, local library literacy programs, state and local leaders from the adult education and literacy field, SLRCs, students, national analysts and researchers, representatives of federal and state government, and concerned business representatives.

The alliance would be an excellent forum in which to develop policy and resources and promote the sharing of resources. It might have a small publications component. Its lifespan could be determined by the membership.

The Center for the Book or the ALA might provide a home for the new initiative, with funding to be sought from multiple outside sources.

RECOMMENDATION #5:

State librarians should form an action group, perhaps within COSLA, to plan for their wider and more effective involvement in supporting and developing adult literacy services in their local public libraries.

A major goal should be to become more active participants in all state and national planning forums where policy and funding issues for literacy are the focus, and where they and public library literacy programs have a stake.

Librarians must insist on having a full and equal partnership role, but adult literacy and education professionals must also become more aware of the education and literacy role of public libraries and take steps to include them.

RECOMMENDATION #6:

In parallel to the COSLA action group suggested in #5, state librarians should develop regular two-way channels of communication with local libraries offering adult literacy services.

The communications link would improve the understanding each has of what the other is doing, build an atmosphere of mutual support and trust, and provide a

126

stronger framework within which to work together.

RECOMMENDATION #7:

Create a national library literacy data collection system.

At the national level, partners to this effort might include such groups as the American Library Association, COSLA (representing state libraries), and the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). At the state level, state libraries might be able to assume the responsibility. Some do this superbly now.

The format suggested in this report (pp. 62-65) is built around categories already in use at NCES and is worthy of consideration, but the essential need is for all players to use the same framework so that comparable data can be generated—and so that general reports about public libraries can see at a glance how adult literacy fits into their overall programs of public service.

Funding for the system would probably require a partnership of state and national sources and both the public and private sectors.

RECOMMENDATION #8:

Existing journals and newsletters of literacy and library organizations should give regular coverage to library literacy programs for the purpose of making their role and accomplishments more widely recognized.

RECOMMENDATION #9:

The ALA, the National Commission on Libraries & Information Science, COSLA, the voluntary organizations, and other leading groups should issue official resolutions giving consistent and unequivocal attention to the important role of public libraries in providing adult literacy services.

RECOMMENDATION #10:

A project should be launched to develop and disseminate information to local library literacy programs about good models of library literacy service.

The new Lila Wallace Fund initiative will do this very thing with the thirteen library literacy programs they have selected for their demonstration effort. But that effort will unfold slowly over three years and good information is needed now as a practical tool for advocates, program developers, and policymakers. It could easily be developed. To start, many worthy candidates for inclusion in the project can be found among the 63 programs included in this study.

The ALA, the Center for the Book, the National Institute for Literacy, or the U.S. Department of Education could take the lead here.

RECOMMENDATION #11:

As a national goal, the President, the Administration, and the Congress should commit to the wider use of technology in public libraries *for the advancement of library literacy programs.*

The initiative would enable state libraries and local public library literacy programs to acquire hardware and software, and to develop the related technical and support staff they need to improve their education and information services.

The initiative would be good for America and good for public libraries. Such a commitment would be consistent with action already taken to foster the greater use of technology in the schools. Some foundations have a strong interest in technology and could be a source of funding.

RECOMMENDATION #12:

An appropriate national organization, or a collaboration of several, should undertake a project to gather and disseminate the information local library literacy programs need about effective uses of technology for both program management and instruction.

RECOMMENDATION #13:

Although computers, the Internet, and distance learning technology have great appeal and potential, their wider implementation should be adopted only after the most careful consideration of the benefits—in terms of individual learning, program outcomes,

economies of scale, and access.

RECOMMENDATION #14:

State and local public libraries should explore ways to expand space allocations for literacy programs or to find innovative space-sharing arrangements.

New technology will require additional space and many programs are already overcrowded.

The development of mechanisms for sharing resources across communities and regions might be the answer in some cases.

RECOMMENDATION #15:

A campaign of information and discussion should be launched to increase understanding throughout the field and in the political arena about the important role of public libraries in adult literacy. The campaign could be sponsored by established literacy and library groups.

One strand of these activities might be for the U.S. Department of Education or the National Institute for Literacy to organize discussions around this report at the regional, state, or local level. State education departments might be asked to join in.

Another strand could consist of panels and workshops incorporated into the regular conferences of such national groups as Literacy Volunteers of America, Laubach Literacy, and the ALA. State and regional meetings convened for and by the literacy and library fields would provide plenty of other opportunities.

RECOMMENDATION #16:

At every level of the field, explorations should be made into how the much-needed greater degree of collaboration and cooperation can be achieved.

Coordination efforts carry heavy staff and financial costs and place a heavy burden on library literacy programs. But they will be increasingly necessary as funding becomes tighter.

Local library literacy programs in particular cannot reasonably be expected to enter into new partnership arrangements without affordable options for doing it.

The alliances and action groups recommended above (#4, #5, and #6) should make this one of their highest priorities.

RECOMMENDATION #17:

The U.S. Department of Education, the National Institute for Literacy, the National Coalition for Literacy, and others should join forces to impress upon Congress the immediacy of the need to restore funding for the valuable but endangered SLRCs—at the federal level, through state block earmarks, or both.

Although SLRCs are not the central focus of this study, they are a crucial resource for public libraries and for everyone working at the state level to advance adult literacy.

RECOMMENDATION #18:

The structure and legislated role of the SLRCs should be reviewed for the purpose of reconstituting them if necessary to guarantee their future viability and effectiveness.

One new approach to consider is suggested on pages 44-47 of this report.

RECOMMENDATION #19:

The groups that would be formed and that are challenged to action by many of the above recommendations should shape a clearly-articulated definition of the purpose and role of public library adult literacy programs, seek agreement for it through wide consultations with local groups, and use the validated definition in a single voice to advance the public library role in adult literacy.

This report contains the makings for that definition. But whatever definition is agreed on, four fundamental facts should stand at its core:

◆ Outside literacy programs acquire access to the basic reading collections and many other valuable resources of the library because the library provides sponsorship and space. Most of these resources are generally minor items in a library's overall budget but they would be prohibitively expensive for small external programs on their own.

◆ The library culture is a uniquely user-friendly environment for adult learners and offers a flexible climate in which programs can be customized to meet their real life needs.

◆ Libraries are a fundamental cornerstone of knowledge and information. America and Americans gain in many concrete ways from the efforts of public libraries to help develop literate communities of users.

◆ Most important of all, in providing basic literacy services to adults with the least skills—whether through their own tutoring or through the tutoring of the voluntary and CBO groups to which they provide a home—public libraries give educational access to the adults most in need of help, to people who either would not be served at all by schools and traditional ABE programs or could not be served by them effectively.

APPENDIX A
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study has come to fruition because many people offered friendship, support, and understanding when it was most needed. It would have been impossible without them.

Special thanks to Mary Keenan for her keen wit, and for her administrative and secretarial help. Diana Byer, having no knowledge of adult literacy, served as a reader on numerous occasions to test the report's readability and clarity. Wilma McCarley and Betsy Feist generously contributed their editorial and proofing services, and they were a source of many good ideas. Bess Heitner gave invaluable help with telephone interviewing. Harold McGraw, Jr., and Dan Lacy were unwavering in their trust, loyalty, and words of encouragement. They were also responsible for arranging the funding for this study.

John Cole of the Center for the Book must have wondered at times why it was all taking so long, but he and his staff showed unfailing good humor, patience, and flexibility from start to finish. Peggy Barber and staff of the American Library Association were prompt, thoughtful, and good natured about providing information.

Friendship, advice, and support also came from other sources, especially from McGraw-Hill. Sue Wallman's enthusiasm and helpfulness were a source of inspiration. Many McGraw-Hill staff were involved in maintaining telephone, mail, and copy services to go along with the space the company gave as a home for the project. Some of them were surprised to find strangers in their midst but they rose graciously to the occasion.

APPENDIX B
PRINCIPAL STUDY ADVISORS

(Key: 1 Data Review Panel, 2 Questionnaire Design, 3 Project Design/Scope, 4 Nominated local library literacy programs)

Mr. Al Bennett (2)
Literacy Specialist
Library Development Services Bureau
California State Library
PO Box 942837
Sacramento, CA 94237-0001
Ph: 916-653-7743
email: abennett@library.ca.gov

Mr. Dan Boyd (1,2)
Coordinator, State Literacy Projects
Library Development Division
South Dakota State Library & Achives
(& Director, State Literacy Resource Center)
800 Governors Drive
Pierre, SD 57501
Ph: 605-773-3131
Fax: 605-773-4950
email: dand@stlib.state.sd.us

Mr. Forrest Chisman (1,2,3)
President
Southport Institute for Policy Analysis
106 Shipping Creek Road
Stevensville, MD 21666
Ph: 410-643-0135
Fax: 410-643-0137

Ms. Jinx Crouch (1)
President Emerita
Literacy Volunteers of America
4187 Palmer Road
Manlius, NY 13104
Ph & Fax: 315-682-5706

Ms. Virginia M. Heinrich (1,2,4)
Library Services Specialist
Adult Literacy Resource Center
2115 Summit Avenue, Mall #5019
St. Paul, MN 55105
Ph: 612-962-5569
Fax: 612-962-5406

Ms. Jane Heiser (1,3)
Administrative Librarian
Library Programs/OERI
U.S. Department of Education
555 New Jersey Avenue NW
Washington, DC 20208-5571
Ph: 202-219-1313
Fax: 202-219-1725
email: jheiser@inet.ed.gov

Ms. Barbara Humes (1,2,3)
Team Leader, Libraries & Community Based Education
Institute of Postsecondary Education, Libraries, &
Lifelong Learning
OERI/U.S. Department of Education
555 New Jersey Avenue NW
Washington, DC 20208-5571
Ph: 202-219-1376
Fax: 202-219-2030
email: bhumes@inet.ed.gov

Ms. Deborah Wilcox Johnson (3)
Johnson & Johnson Consulting
1015 Holiday Drive
Waunakee, WI 53597-1536
Ph: 608-849-7286
Fax: 68-849-7521

Ms. Linda Kay (3)
Consultant, Library Development Bureau
& Program Manager, LSCA Literacy Grants
New Jersey State Library
186 West State Street, CN 520
Trenton, NJ 08625-0520
Ph: 609-984-3286
Fax: 609-984-7898

Ms. Suzanne Knell (2,4)
Executive Director
Illinois Literacy Resource Development Center
209 West Clark Street
Champaign, IL 61820
Ph: 217-355-6068
Fax: 217-355-6347

Mr. Dan Lacy (1,2)
Former Exec. Vice President, McGraw-Hill Inc.
Business Council for Effective Literacy
54 Forest at Duke Road
Durham, NC 27705
Ph: 919-490-8575

Ms. Bridget Lamont (1,2)
State Librarian
Illinois State Library
300 South Second Street
Springfield, IL 62701
Ph: 217-782-2994
Fax: 217-785-4326
email: blamont@library.sos.state.il.us

Ms. Susan O'Connor (2,3)
Director, Literacy Program
Brooklyn Public Library
Grand Army Plaza
Brooklyn, NY 11238
Ph: 718-780-7819
Fax: 718-783-1770

Mr. James Parker (1)
Adult Learning Specialist
Division of Adult Education & Literacy
U.S. Department of Education
330 C Street SW - Rm 4422
Washington, DC 20202-7240
Ph: 202-205-5499
Fax: 202-205-9873
email: james_parker@ed.gov

Ms. Shelley Quezada (1,2,3,4)
Educational Consultant
Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners
648 BeaconStreet
Boston, MA 02115
Ph: 617-267-9400
Fax: 617-421-9833
email:squezada@mecn.mass.edu

Ms. Diane Rosenthal (1,2)
Program Director
Centers for Reading & Writing
New York Public Library
Bloomingdale Branch
150 West 100th Street
New York, NY 10025
Ph: 212-932-7893
Fax: 212-932-2421

Ms. Virginia Schantz (1,2)
Director, MARC Literacy Program
Greenville Public Library
205 S. Franklin
Greenville, MI 48838
Ph: 616-754-1391
Fax: 616-754-1398

Ms. Betty Ann Scott (1,4)
Library Literacy Consultant
Bureau of Library Development
State Library of Florida
Department of State
R.A. Gray Building
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0250
Ph: 904-487-2651
Fax: 904-488-2746

Ms. Mary Siedow (3)
Director
North Carolina Literacy Resource Center
530 N. Wilmington Street
Raleigh, NC 27604
Ph: 919-715-5794
email: nclrc@nando.net

Ms. Judy Stark (1,3)
Director, Library Literacy Program
Office of Educational Research & Improvement
U.S. Department of Education
555 New Jersey Avenue NW
Washington, DC 20208
Ph: 202-219-1725
Fax: 202-219-2284
email: jstark@inet.ed.gov

Mr. Gary Strong (2,3)
President
Queens Borough Public Library
89-11 Merrick Boulevard
Jamaica, NY 11432
Ph: 718-990-0794
Fax: 718-291-8936

Ms. Carole Talan (1,2,3,4)
Executive Director
California Literacy ResourceCenter
9738 Lincoln Village Drive
Sacramento, CA 95827-2676
Ph: 916-228-2760
Fax: 916-228-2676

Mr. Peter Waite (1)
Executive Director
Laubach Literacy Action
1320 Jamesville Avenue
Syracuse, NY 13210
Ph: 315-422-9121
Fax: 315-422-6369

Ms. Nancy Weatherman (1,2,3)
Coordinator
Planning & Development Section
Tennessee State Library & Archives
Department of State
403 Seventh Avenue, North
Nashville, TN 37219
Ph: 615-532-4627
Fax: 615-741-6471
email: nweather@mail.state.tn.us

APPENDIX C
STUDY PARTICIPANTS: QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONDEES

Chief Officers of State Library Agencies

Ms. Patricia L. Harris
Director
Alabama Public Library Service
6030 Monticello Drive
Montgomery, AL 36130
Ph: 334-213-3900
Fax: 334-213-3993
email: p_1_harris@solinet.net

Mr. John A. Murphey
State Librarian
Arkansas State Library
One Capitol Mall
Little Rock, AR 72201
Ph: 501-682-1526
Fax: 501-6828-1529

Mr. Hardy R. Franklin
Director
District of Columbia Public Library
901 G Street, NW
Washington, DC 20001
Ph: 202-727-1101
Fax: 202-727-1129

Mr. Tom Sloan
Director
Division of Libraries
Department of Education
43 South Dupont Highway
Dover, DE 19901
Ph: 302-739-4748
Fax: 302-739-6787
email: tsloan@kentnet.dtcc.edu

Mr. Barrett Wilkins
State Librarian
State Library of Florida
R.A. Gray Building
Tallahassee, FL 32301
Ph: 904-487-2651
Fax: 904-488-2746

Mr. Bartholomew A. Kane
State Librarian
Office of Hawaii State Library
Department of Education
465 S. King Street #B1
Honolulu, HI 96813-2909
Ph: 808-586-3704
Fax: 808-586-3715

Mr. Tom Ploeg
State Librarian
Division of Public Library Services
State Department of Technology & Adult Education
156 Trinity Avenue SW
Atlanta, GA 30303
Ph: 404-657-6220
Fax: 404-656-7297

Mr. Sharman Smith
Director
State Library of Iowa
East 12th Street & Grand
Des Moines, IA 50319
Ph: 515-281-4105
Fax: 515-281-6191

Mr. Charles Bolles
State Librarian
Idaho State Library
324 West State Street
Boise, ID 83702
Ph: 28-334-4124
Fax: 28-334-4016

Ms. Bridget L. Lamont
State Librarian
Illinois State Library
300 South Second Street
Springfield, IL 62701
Ph: 217-782-2994
Fax: 217-785-4326
email: blamont@library.sos.state.il.us

Mr. Charles Ray Ewick
Director
Indiana State Library
140 North Senate Avenue
Indianapolis, IN 46204
Ph: 317-232-3692
Fax: 317-232-3728
email: ewick@statelib.lib.in.us

Mr. Duane Johnson
State Librarian
Kansas State Library
State Capitol, Third Floor
Topeka,KS 66612
Ph: 913-296-3296
Fax: 913-296-6650

Mr. James A. Nelson
State Librarian
Department for Library & Archives
300 Coffee Tree Road
Frankfort, KY 40602
Ph: 502-875-7000
Fax: 502-562-5773

Mr. Maurice J. Travillian
Assistant State Supervisor for Libraries
State Department of Education
200 West Baltimore Street
Baltimore, MD 21201
Ph: 410-767-0434
Fax: 410-333-2507

Mr. Richard Arnold
Director
Maine State Library
State House Station #64
Augusta, ME 04333
Ph: 207-287-5600
Fax: 207-287-5615

Mr. Jeffrey Johnson
Deputy State Librarian
Library of Michigan
735 East Michigan Avenue
Lansing, MI 48909
Ph: 517-373-1580
Fax: 517-373-4480

Mr. William Asp
Director
Office of Public Library & Interlibrary Cooperation
Division of Library Development Services
Department of Children, Families, & Learning
440 Capitol Square
550 Cedar Street
St. Paul, MN 55101
Ph: 612-296-2821
Fax: 612-296-5418

Ms. Mary Ellen Pellington
Executive Director
Mississippi Library Commission
1221 Ellis Street
Jackson, MS 39209
Ph: 601-359-1036
Fax: 601-354-4181

Mr. Richard Miller
State Librarian
Montana State Library
1515 East 6th Avenue
Helena, MT 59620
Ph: 406-444-3116
Fax: 406-444-5612
email: rtm_msl@wln.com

Mr. Joseph Linnertz
Acting State Librarian
North Dakota State Library
Liberty Memorial Building
Capitol Grounds
Highway 83 North
Bismarck, ND 58505
Ph: 701-328-2727
Fax: 702-328-2040

Mr. Rod Wagner
Director
Nebraska Library Commission
1200 N Street #120
Lincoln, NE 68508-2023
Ph: 402-471-4001
Fax: 402-471-2083

Mr. Kendall Wiggin
State Librarian
New Hampshire State Library
20 Park Street
Concord, NH 03301
Ph: 603-271-2397
Fax: 603-271-6826
email: wiggin@lilac.nhsl.lib.nh.us

Mr. Jack Livingstone
Acting State Librarian
New Jersey State Library
CN520
185 W. State Street
Trenton, NJ 08625
Ph: 609-292-6200
Fax: 609-292-2746

Ms. Karen Watkins
State Librarian
New Mexico State Library
325 Don Gaspar
Santa Fe, NM 87503
Ph: 505-827-3804
Fax: 505-827-3888

Ms. Joan Kerschner
State Librarian
Nevada State Library & Archives
Capitol Complex
Carson City, NV 89710
Ph: 702-687-8315
Fax: 702-687-8311

Mr. Mike Lucas
Acting State Librarian
Ohio State Library
65 South Front Street
Columbus, OH 43215
Ph: 614-644-6845
Fax: 614-466-3584

Mr. James Scheppke
Director
Oregon State Library
State Library Building
Salem, OR 97310
Ph: 503-378-4367
Fax: 503-588-7119

Mr. Gary Wolfe
Commissioner
Commonwealth Libraries
Box 1601
Harrisburgh, PA 17105
Ph: 717-787-2646
Fax: 717-772-3265
email: wolfe@hslc.org

Ms. Barbara Weaver
Director
Rhode Island Department of
State Library Service
300 Richmond Street
Providence, RI 02903-4222
Ph: 401-277-2728
Fax: 401-831-5140

Ms. Jane Kolbe
State Librarian
South Dakota State Library
800 Governors Drive
Pierre, SD 57501-2294
Ph: 605-773-3131
Fax: 605-773-4950

Mr. Edwin Gleaves
State Librarian
Tennessee State Library & Archives
403 Seventh Avenue N.
Nashville, TN 37219
Ph: 615-741-7996
Fax: 515-741-6471

Mr. Robert S. Martin
Director & Librarian
Texas State Library
Box 12927, Capitol Station
Austin, TX 78711
Ph: 512-463-5460
Fax: 512-463-5436
email: robert.martin@tsl.state.tx.us

Ms. Amy Owen
Director
Utah State Library
2150 South 300 West - Suite 16
Salt Lake City, UT 85115
Ph: 801-466-5888
Fax: 801-533-4657

Mr. William J.Wilson
Administrator
Division for Library Services
Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction
125 South Webster - Rm 325
Madison, WI 53707-7841
Ph: 68-266-2205
Fax: 68-267-1052

Mr. Frederick J.Glazer
Director
West Virginia Library Commission
Science & Cultural Center
Charleston, WV 25305
Ph: 304-558-2041
Fax: 304-558-2044

Key State Library Agency Literacy Contacts:

Ms. Aja Markel Razumny
Library Development Coordinator
Alaska State Library
PO Box 110571
Juneau, AK 99811-0571
Ph: 907-465-22458
Fax: 907-469-2665
email: ajar@muskox.alaska.edu

Ms. Jennelle Stephens
Deputy Director
Library Development Unit
Arkansas State Library
One Capitol Mall
Little Rock, AR 72201
Ph: 501-682-2159
email: jstephen@comp.uark.edu

Mr. Al Bennett
Literacy Specialist
Library Development Services Bureau
California State Library
Box 942837
Sacramento, CA 94237-0001
Ph: 916-653-7743
Fax: 916-653-8443
email: abennet@library.ca.gov

Ms. Mary Willoughby
Program Manager
Colorado Literacy Action
Office of Library & Adult Services
Colorado Department of Education
201 E. Colfax Avenue - Rm. 100
Denver, CO 80203
Ph: 303-866-6743
Fax: 303-866-6947
email: willoughby_m@cde.state.co.us

Ms. Patricia Owens
Director
Division of Library Development
Connecticut State Library
231 Capitol Avenue
Hartford, CT 06106
Ph: 203-566-5607
email: powens@csunet.ctstateeu.edu

Ms. Annie Norman
Administrative Librarian
Delaware Division of Libraries
Department of State
43 S. Dupont Highway
Dover, DE 19901
Ph: 302-739-4748, x126
Fax: 302-739-6787
email: norman@kentnet.dtcc.edu

Ms. Betty Ann Scott
Library Consultant for Literacy
Bureau of Library Development
State Library of Florida
R.A. Gray Building
Tallahassee, FL 32399
Ph: 904-487-2651
Fax: 904-488-2746
email: bascott@dlis.state.fl.us

Mr. Tom Ploeg
Ms. Cheryl Rogers
State Librarian
Division of Public Library Services
State Department of Technology & Adult Education
156 Trinity Avenue SW
Atlanta, GA 30303
Ph: 404-657-6220
Fax: 404-656-7297

Ms. Susan Nakata
Statewide Literacy Coordinator
Hawaii State Public Library System
465 South King Street - Rm.B-1
Honolulu, HI 96813
Ph: 88-259-9925
Fax: 808-259-8209

Mr. Gerry Rowland
Literacy Consultant
Bureau of Library Development
State Library of Iowa
East 12th and Grand
Des Moines, IA 50219
Ph: 515-281-7573
Fax: 515-281-6191

Ms. Peggy McClendon
Special Projects Coordinator
Library Development Division
Idaho State Library
325 West State Street
Boise, ID 83702
Ph: 208-334-2153
Fax: 208-334-4016
email: pmcclend@isl.state.id.us

Ms. Judith Rake
Literacy Program Director
Literacy Program Office
Illinois State Library
4th and Jackson Street
Springfield, IL 62756
Ph: 217-785-6921
email: jrake@library.sos.state.il.us

Ms. Martha Roblee
Associate Director for Library Development
& Network Coordinator
Indiana State Library
140 N. Senate Avenue
Indianapolis, IN 46204
Ph: 317-232-3697
Fax: 317-232-5970

Ms. Vikki Stewart
Literacy Program Coordinator
Kansas State Library
PO Box 188
Kingman, KS 67068
Ph: 316-532-1075
Fax: 316-532-1076
email: ksst15lb@ink.org

Mr. Jim Edwards
Adult Services Coordinator
Kentucky Department for Libraries & Archives
300 Coffee Tree Road
PO Box 537
Frankfort, KY 40601
Ph: 502-564-8300, x266
Fax: 502-564-5773

Mr. Gary Rolstad
Associate State Librarian
State Library of Louisiana
PO Box 131
760 N. Third Street
Baton Rouge, LA 7821-0131
Ph: 504-342-4931
Fax: 504-342-3547
email: grolstad@pelican.state.lib.la.us

Ms. Shelley Quezada
Consultant
Library Services to the Unserved
Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners
648 Beacon Street
Boston, MA 02215
Ph: 617-267-9400
email: squezada@mecn.mass.edu

Ms. Rivkah Sass
Branch Chief, Public Libraries
Division of Library Development
State Department of Education
200 West Baltimore
Baltimore, MD 21201
Ph: 410-767-0450
Fax: 410-333-2507
email: rs207@umail.umd.edu

Ms. Peggy Stewart
Consultant
Central Main Library District
Maine State Library
State House, Station #64
Augusta, ME 04333
Ph: 207-287-5620
Fax: 207-287-5624
email: slrarno@gatekeeper.ddp.state.me.us

Ms. Joan Groening
Federal Division Program Director
The Library of Michigan
717 West Allegan Avenue
POB 30007
Lansing, MI 48909
Ph: 517-373-1580
Fax:517-373-5700

Mr. Roger Sween
Library Specialist
Minnesota Library Development & Services
443 Capitol Square Building
550 Cedar Street
St. Paul, MN 55101
Ph: 612-296-2821
Fax: 612-296-5418
email: rogers@mde-net.educ.state.mn.us

Ms. Madeline Matson
Director of Publications
& Senior Consultant
Missouri State Library
2002 Missouri Boulevard
Jefferson City, MO 65102-0387
Ph: 314-751-3033
email: mmatson@mail.more.net

Ms. Jean Hudspeth
Outreach Services Coordinator
Library Development Division
Mississippi Library Commission
1221 Ellis Avenue
Jackson, MS 39209
Ph: 601-359-1036
Fax: 601-354-4181
email: libdev@mlc.lib.ms.us

Mr. Mike Jaugstetter
Literacy Consultant
Library Development Division
North Dakota State Library
604 East Boulevard
Bismarck, ND 58505
Ph: 701-328-4654
Fax: 702-328-2040

Ms. Mary Jackson
Library Services Coordinator
Department of Library Development
Nebraska Library Commission
1200 N. Street, Ste. 120
Lincoln, NE 6858
Ph: 402-471-4006
Fax: 402-471-2013
email: mjackson@neon.nlc.state.ne.us

Ms. Rebecca Albert
Literacy Coordinator
Library Development Services Section
New Hampshire State Library
20 Park Street
Concord, NH 03301-6314
Ph: 603-271-2425
Fax: 603-271-6826

Ms. Linda Kay
Consultant
New Jersey State Library
185 West State Street- CN520
Trenton, NJ 08625-0520
Ph: 609-984-3286
Fax: 609-984-7900

Mr. Scott Sheldon
Program Manager
Library Development Unit
New Mexico State Library
325 Don Gasper
Santa Fe, NM 87503
Ph: 505-827-388
Fax: 505-827-388
email: Lsheldon@stlib.state.nm.us

Ms. Maurine Read
Library Development Specialist
Division of Library Development
New York State Library
Rm. 10C50
Cultural Education Center
Albany, NY 12230
Ph: 518-486-4860
Fax: 518-486-5254
email: mread@unix2.nysed.gov

Mr. Floyd Dickman
Literacy Consultant
Library Development Division
State Library of Ohio
65 S. Front Street
Columbus, OH 43215-4163
Ph: 614-644-6906
Fax: 614-466-3584
email: fdickman@slonet.ohio.gov

Ms. Mary Ginnane
Library Development Administrator
Library Development Services Unit
Oregon State Library
State Library Building
Salem, OR 97310
Ph: 503-378-2112, x225
email: mary.i.ginnane@state.or.us

Ms. Leslie Gelders
Literacy Coordinator
Public Information Office
Oklahoma Department of Libraries
200 N.E. 18th Street
Oklahoma City, OK 73105
Ph: 405-521-2502

Ms. Elizabeth A. Funk
Advisor
Library Development Division
State Library of Pennsylvania
Box 1601
Harrisburg, PA 17105
Ph: 717-783-5732
Fax: 717-783-5728
email: funk@shrsys.hslc.org

Ms. Jane Connor
Literacy Consultant
Library Development Division
South Carolina State Library
1500 Senate Street - Box 11469
Columbia, SC 29211
Ph: 803-734-8666
Fax: 803-734-8676
email: JaneC@leo.scsl.state.sc.us

Mr. Dan Boyd
Coordinator
State Literacy Projects
Library Development Division
South Dakota State Library & Archives
800 Governors Drive
Pierre, SD 57501
Ph: 605-773-3131
email: dand@stlib.state.sd.us

Ms. Nancy Weatherman
Special Projects Coordinator
Planning and Development Section
Tennessee State Library & Archives
403 Seventh Avenue, North
Nashville, TN 37243-0312
Ph: 615-532-4627
Fax: 615-741-6471

Ms. Patty Davis
Special Services Consultant
Library Development Division
Texas State Library
Box 12927-Capitol Station
Austin, TX 78711
Ph: 512-463-5460
email: patty_davis@tsl.texas.gov

Ms. Elizabeth Roderick
Assistant Director
Library Development & Networking Division
The Library of Virginia
11th Street at Capitol Square
Richmond, VA 23219-3491
Ph: 804-786-2332
Fax: 804-786-5855

Ms. Marianne Kotch
Regional Libraries Services Coordinator
Vermont Department of Libraries
Midstate Regional Library
RR#4, Box 1870
Montpelier, VT 05602
Ph: 802-828-2320
email: mkotch@dol.state.vt.us

Ms. Karen Goettling
Literacy Project Coordinator
Library Planning and Development Division
Washington State Library
AJ-11
Olympia, WA 98504-0111
Ph: 206-753-2114
email: kgoettli@wln.com

Ms. Donna Calvert
Consultant
Direct Services Department
West Virginia Library
1900 Kanawha Boulevard, East
Charleston, WV 2533305
Ph: 304-348-2531

Ms. Frances de Usabel
Consultant
Library Services for Special Users
Bureau for Library Development
Division for Library Services
Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction
PO Box 7841
Madison, WI 53707-7841
Ph: 608-266-0419
Fax: 608-267-1052

Ms. Judith L. Yeo
Literacy Coordinator
Wyoming Alliance for Literacy
Wyoming State Library
Supreme Court & State Library Building
Cheyenne, WY 82002-0650
Ph: 307-777-5914
email: jyeo@windy.state.wy.us

State Literacy Resource Centers

Ms. Connie Munro
Mr. David Alexander
State Literacy Resource Center
Department of Education
801 West 10th Street, Suite 200
Juneau, AK 99801-1894
Ph: 907-465-8714
Fax: 907-279-3299

Mr. Joe Macaluso
Director
Alabama Adult Literacy Resource Center
Department of Education
5343 Gordon Persons Building
PO Box 302101
Montgomery, AL 36104-3833
Ph: 334-242-8181
Fax: 334-242-2236
email: macaluso@sdenet.alsde.edu

Ms. Maureen Ambrose
Executive Director
The Arizona Adult Literacy & Technology
Resource Center, Inc.
730 East Highland
Phoenix, AZ 85014
Ph: 602-265-0231
Fax: 602-265-7403

Dr. Carole Talan
Executive Director
California Literacy Resource Center
9738 Lincoln Village Drive
Sacramento, CA 95827-3399
Ph: 916-228-2760
Fax: 916-228-2676
email: talan@otan.dni.us

Ms. Mary Willoughby
Ms. Debra Fawcett
Colorado State Literacy Resource Center
Department of Education
State Library & Adult Education Office
201 E. Colfax Avenue, Rm. 100
Denver, CO 80203
Ph: 303-866-6609
Fax: 303-830-0793
email: willoughby_M@cde.state.co.us

Ms. Mary Fiorelli
Information Specialist
Literacy Resource Center
Adult Training and Development Network
111 Charter Oak Avenue
Hartford, CT 06106
Ph: 860-524-4010
Fax: 860-246-3304
email: mfioreli@crec.org

Ms. Daphne Mathews
Executive Director
Delaware State Literacy Resource Center
Delaware State University
Education and Humanity Center, Rm. 103
Dover, DE 19901
Ph: 302-739-6959
Fax: 302-739-5220
email: acenetwork@aol.com

Mr. James M. Newell
(former Director
FL State Literacy Resource Center)

573 Stonehouse Road
Tallahassee, FL 32301
Ph: 904-671-3491

Ms. Sue Berg
Statewide Literacy Coordinator
Hawaii State Public Library System
465 South King Street, B-1
Honolulu, HI 96813
Ph: 808-259-8209
Fax: 808-259-9925

Mr. James E. Sixta
Administrator
Northeast Iowa Regional Library System
415 Commercial Street
Waterloo, IA 50701
Ph: 319-233-1200
Fax: 319-233-1964
email: sixta@cobra.uni.edu

Ms. Judith Rake
Literacy Program Director
Illinois Network of Literacy/
Adult Education Resources
431 South 4th Street
Springfield, Il 62701
Ph: 217-785-6921
Fax: 217-785-6927
email: jrake@library.sos.state.il.us

Ms. Gael Deppert
Director
Indiana Literacy & Technical Education
Resource Center
Indiana State Library
140 North Senate Avenue, Rm. 208
Indianapolis, IN 46204
Ph: 317-233-5200
Fax: 317-233-5333
email: gdeppert@stlib.lib.in.us

Ms. Janet Stotts
Ms. Dianne Glass
Co-Directors
Kansas State Literacy Resource Center
Kansas State Board of Education
120 South E. 10th Avenue
Topeka, KS 66612
Ph: 913-296-3192
Fax: 913-296-7933
email: jstotts@smtpgw.ksbe.state.ks.us
dglass@smtpgw.ksbe.state.ks.us

Ms. Kaye Beall
Director
Kentucky Center for Adult Education & Literacy
1049 U.S. 127 South
Suites 3 and 4
Frankfort, KY 40601
Ph: 502-564-6624
Fax: 502-564-6407

Dr. Jerry Pinsel
Director
Office of Lifelong Learning
Louisiana State Literacy Resource Center
Office of the Governor
PO Box 94004
Baton Rouge, LA 70804-9004
Ph: 504-342-2462
Fax: 504-342-1494

Ms. Patricia Thomas-Towns
Coordinator
Maryland State Adult Literacy Resource Center
Maryland State Department of Education
200 West Baltimore Street
Baltimore, MD 21201
Ph: 410-767-076
Fax: 410-333-2099

Ms. Virginia Watson
Director
State Literacy Resource Center
Central Michigan University
Ronan Hall, Rm. 219
Washington Street
Mt. Pleasant, MI 48859
Ph: 517-774-7690
Fax: 517-774-2181
email: 3431Z67@cmuvm.csv.smich.edu

Ms. Virginia M. Heinrich
Coordinator
Minnesota Adult Literacy Resource Center
University of St. Thomas
2115 Summit Avenue- Mail #: 5019
St. Paul, MN 55105
Ph: 612-962-5569
Fax: 612-962-5406
emmail: vmheinrich@stthomas.edu

Ms. Diana Schmidt
Executive Director
Literacy Investment For Tomorrow (LIFT)
300 South Broadway
St. Louis, MO 63102
Ph: 314-421-1970
Fax: 314-539-5170
email: stodea@aol.com

Ms. Judy Williams
Director
Mississippi State Literacy Resource Center
Governor's Office of Literacy
3825 Ridgewood Road
Jackson, MS 39211
Ph: 601-982-6591
Fax: 601-364-2319
email: judy@gol.state.ms.us.

Mr. Richard Miller
Director
Montana State Literacy Resource Center
Montana State Library
1515 East 6th Avenue
Helena, MT 59620-1800
Ph: 406-444-3116
Fax: 406-444-5612

Dr. Mary Dunn Siedow
Director
North Carolina Literacy Resource Center
530 N. Wilmington Street
Raleigh, NC 27604
Ph: 919-715-5794
Fax: 919-715-5796
email: mdsiedow@nando.net

Mr. G. David Massey
Director
Statewide Adult Education Resource Center
Division of Adult Education & Literacy
Department of Public Instruction
600 East Boulevard Avenue
Bismarck, ND 58505-0440
Ph: 701-328-2393
Fax: 701-328-4770
email: dmassey@c.1as400.state.nd.us

Professor John M. Dirkx
Director
Nebraska Institute for the Study of Adult Literacy
Division of Adult & Continuing Education
519-A Nebraska Hall
University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Lincoln, NE 68588-0515
Ph: 402-472-5924
Fax: 402-472-5907
email: jdirkx@unlinfo.unl.edu

Mr. Art Ellison
Administrator
Bureau of Adult Education
New Hampshire Department of Education
101 Pleasant Street
Concord, NH 03301
Ph: 603-271-6698
Fax: 603-271-1953
email: a_elison@tech.nh.us

Ms. Janet F. Buongiorno
Coordinator
Adult Literacy Enhancement Center
Academy for Professional Development
1090 King George Post Road, Bldg. #9
Edison, NJ 08837
Ph: 908-225-8508
Fax: 908-225-0235

Ms. Michelle Jaschke
Resource Developer
New Mexico Coalition for Literacy
1510 St. Francis Drive
PO Box 6085
Santa Fe, NM 87502
Ph: 505-982-3997
Fax: 505-982-4095
email: mmjnmcl@aol.com

Mr. Joseph Mangano
Acting Director
New York State Literacy Resource Center
State University of New York
135 Western Avenue, Rm. 208 Husted
Albany, NY 12222
Ph: 518-442-5510
Fax: 518-442-3933

Ms. Jean Stephens
Director
The Ohio Literacy Resource Center
Kent State University
414 White Hall
PO Box 5190
Kent, OH 44242-0001
Ph: 216-672-2007
Fax: 216-672-4841
email: olrc@kentvm.kent.edu

Mr. Ira Isch
Director
Oklahoma Literacy Resource Center
Oklahoma Department of Libraries
200 Northeast 18th Street
Oklahoma City, OK 73105-3298
Ph: 405-5221-2502
Fax: 405-525-7804
email: iiisch@aol.com

Ms. Evelyn Werner
Director
ADVANCE Clearinghouse and Resource Center
Pennsylvania Department of Education
333 Market Street, 11th floor
Harrisburg, PA 17126-0333
Ph: 717-783-9192
Fax: 717-783-5420
email: Werner@hslc.org

Ms. Dianna Deaderick
Director
South Carolina Literacy Resource Center
State Department of Education
1722 Main Street, Suite 104
Columbia, SC 29201
Ph: 803-929-2574
Fax: 803-929-2571
email: DiannaDsc@aol.com

Mr. Dan Boyd
Director
South Dakota Literacy Resource Center
State Library
800 Governor's Drive
Pierre, SD 57501
Ph: 605-773-3131
Fax: 605-773-4950
email: danb@stlib.state.sd.us

Ms. Juliet Merrifield
Director
Center for Literacy Studies
Tennessee Literacy Resource Center
University of Tennessee
600 Henley Street, Suite 312
Knoxville, TN 37996-4135
Ph: 423-974-4109
Fax: 423-974-3857
email: bsbell@utkux.utcc.utk.edu

Mr. Murray Meszaros
Specialist
Literacy and Adult Education Resosurce Center
Utah State Office of Education
250 East 500 South
Salt Lake City, UT 84111
Ph: 801-538-7870
Fax: 801-538-7868
email: mmeszaro@usoe.k12.ut.us

Ms. Wendy Ross
Director
Vermont Literacy Resource Center
Department of Education
120 State Street
Montpelier, VT 05620
Ph: 802-828-5148
Fax: 802-828-3146

Ms. Evelyn Nunes
Director
Adult Education & Literacy Resource Center
Virginia Commonwealth University
Oliver Hall S., Rm. 4080
1015 West Main Street, Box 2020
Richmond, VA 23284-2020
Ph: 804-828-6521
Fax: 804-828-2001

Mr. Alan Waugh
Resource Library Coordinator
Northwest Regional Literacy Resource Center
1701 Broadway
Seattle, WA 98122
Ph: 206-587-3882
Fax: 206-344-4377
email: awaugh@seaccd.ctc.edu

Mr. Jim Mueller
Director
Wisconsin Literacy Resource Center
Wisconsin Technical College System Board
310 Price Place
Madison, WI 53707
Ph: 608-266-3497
Fax: 608-266-1690
email: muellej@oar.tec.wi.us

Ms. Linda Andresen
ABE Staff Development Coordinator
The Center for Adult Literacy & Learning (CALL)
RESA III
501 22nd Street
Dunbar, WV 25064
Ph: 304-766-7655x12
Fax: 304-766-7915

Heads of Local Library Literacy Programs

Ms. Lula Thorpe
Director
LVA Anniston Calhoun County
Anniston/Calhoun County Public Library
PO Box 308
Anniston, AL 36202
Ph: 205-237-8501
Fax: 205-238-0474

Ms. Jane Goodwin
Director
Literacy Council of Hot Spring County
Hot Spring County Library
202 East Third
Malvern, AR 71204
Ph: 501-332-4039

Ms. Maxine Kemp
Director
Reading Together
Arkansas River Valley Regional Library
501 N. Front Street
Dardanelle, AR 72384
Ph: 501-229-2993
Fax: 501-229-4456

Ms. Frances Houser
Adult Literacy Coordinator
Napa City County Library
580 Coombs Street
Napa, CA 94559
Ph: 707-253-4283
Fax: 707-253-4615

Ms. Sherry Drobner
Director
Adult Literacy Program
Alameda County Library
2450 Stevenson Boulevard
Fremont, CA 94538
Ph: 510-745-1484
Fax: 510-745-1494

Ms. Ruth Kohan
Partners in Reading
San Jose Public Library
180 West San Carlos Street
San Jose, CA 95113
Ph: 408-277-3230
Fax: 408-277-3047
email: parsjpl@connectinc.com

Ms. Cathay O. Reta
Director
Adult Literacy Program
Commerce Public Library
5655 Jillson Street
Commerce, CA 90040
Ph: 213-722-7323

Ms. Barbara Barwood
Coordinator
LVA Marin County
San Rafael Public Library
1100 E Street
San Rafael, CA 94901
Ph: 415-485-3318
Fax: 415-485-3112
email: marinlit@aol.com

Ms. Caryl LaDuke
Director
Library Literacy Program
Mesa County Public Library District
530 Grand Avenue
PO Box 20,000-5019
Grand Junction, CO 81502
Ph: 970-245-5522
Fax: 970-243-4744
email: claduke@colosys.net

Ms. Beverly Robbins
Director
LVA-Waterbury
Silas Bronson Library
267 Grand Street
Waterbury, CT 06702
Ph: 203-754-1164
Fax: 203-574-8055

Ms. Christel Shumate
Project Reads: Sussex County Literacy Council
Sussex County Department of Libraries
109 East Laurel Street
Georgetown, DE 19947
Ph: 302-855-7890
Fax: 302-855-7895

Ms. Carmen Knox
Director
LVA - Wilmington
Wilmington Library
PO Box 303
Wilmington, DE 19899-2303
Ph: 302-658-5624
Fax: 302-654-9132
email:cknox54793@aol.com

Ms. Christine Gallahar
Director
Project LEAD
Miami-Dade Public Library System
101 West Flagler Street
Miami, FL 33130
Ph: 305-375-5323
email: d00994lc@dcfreenet.seflin.lib.fl.us

Ms. Cindy Anglin
Literacy Coordinator
Panhandle Library Literacy Consortium
Jefferson County Public Library
260 North Cherry Street
Monticello, FL 32344
Ph: 904-342-0264
Fax: 904-342-0207

Ms. Jodi Cohen
Hillsborough Literacy Council
Tampa-Hillsborough County Library System
90 North Ashley Street
Tampa, FL 33602
Ph: 813-273-3650
Fax: 813-273-3707

Ms. Susan H. Buchanan
Director
Library Literacy Program
Brevard County Library
308 Forrest Avenue
Cocoa, FL 32922
Ph: 407-633-1809
Fax: 407-633-1837
email: sbuchana@sunmail.brev.lib.fl.us

Ms. Janet Hansen
Coordinator
Lifelong Learning Services
Broward County Public Library
1409 Sistrunk Boulevard
Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33311
Ph: 305-765-4271
Fax: 305-761-7160

Ms. Jean Brinkman
Literacy Coordinator
Center for Adult Learning (CAL)
Jacksonville Public Libraries
122 North Ocean Street
Jacksonville, FL 32202
Ph: 904-630-2981
Fax: 904-630-2431
email: brinkmj@mail.firn.edu

Mr. Wrenford Archibald
Manager
Learning Center
Athens-Clarke County Public Library
2025 Baxter Street
Athens, GA 30606
Ph: 706-613-3650
Fax: 706-613-3660

Ms. Carrol Maloof
Program Coordinator
Library Literacy Program
Sara Hightower Regional Library
205 Riverside Parkway
Rome, GA 30161
Ph: 706-236-461
Fax: 706-236-4605

Ms. Marian Fincher
Literacy Coordinator
DeKalb County Public Library
215 Sycamore Street
Decatur, GA 30030
Ph: 404-370-8450
Fax: 404-370-8469
email: mimfincher@aol.com

Ms. Beverly Cohen-Saiz
Executive Director
LVA - Elgin
Gail Borden Public Library
200 North Grove Avenue
Elgin, IL 60120
Ph: 708-742-6565
Fax: 708-742-6599

Ms. Jill Rodriguez
Director
Family Literacy Partnership
Bensenville Library
200 S. Church Road
Bensenville, IL 60106
Ph: 708-766-4642
Fax: 708-766-4642
email: jrodrig@dupageis.lib.il.us

Ms. Carol Morris
Literacy Coordinator
Libraries for Literacy in Lake County
Waukegan Public Library
128 North County Street
Waukegan, IL 60085
Ph: 708-623-2041
email: wkgn1@aol.com

Ms. Marilyn Sirugo
Supervisor
Literacy Program
Michigan City Public Library
100 East Fourth Street
Michigan City, IN 46360
Ph: 219-873-3044

Ms. Elizabeth Green
Director
Library Literacy Program
Anderson Public Library
111 East 12th Street
Anderson, IN 46016
Ph: 317-641-2461
Fax: 317-641-2468

Mr. Stephen Cochran
Director
Knox County Literacy Program
Knox County Public Library
502 North 7th Street
Vincennes, IN 47591
Ph: 812-886-0870
Fax: 812-886-0342

Ms. Mona Carmack, Director
Ms. Linda Conley, Liaision to JCCC
Mr. Phil Wegman, Community College
Project Finish
Johnson County Library
PO Box 2933
Shawnee Mission, KS 66201-1333
Ph: 913-495-2400 or 913-967-8620
Fax: 913-495-2060

Ms. Janet Kelly
Read Write/Now Program
Springfield City Library
Mason Square Branch
765 State Street
Springfield, MA 01109
Ph: 413-788-8806

Ms. Lynne Weintraub
Director
Center for New Americans
Jones Library
43 Amity Street
Amherst, MA 01002
Ph: 413-256-4090
email: lynnew@crocker.com

Mr. David Hildt
Newcomer Family Literacy Project
The Lawrence Public Library
51 Lawrence Street
Lawrence, MA 01841
Ph: 508-682-1727
Fax: 508-688-3142
email: hildt@mvlc.lib.ma.us

Ms. Elaine Kline
Director
LVA - Quincy
Thomas Crane Public Library
40 Washington Street
Quincy, MA 02169
Ph: 617-376-1314
Fax: 617-376-1308

Dr. Janet Carsetti
Literacy Specialist
Project Literacy
Howard County Library
10375 Little Patuxent Parkway
Columbia, MD 21044
Ph: 410-313-7900
Fax: 410-313-7864

Ms. Virginia Schantz
Director
MARC Literacy Program
Greenville Public Library
205 S. Franklin Street
Greenville, MI 48838
Ph: 616-754-1391

Ms. Kristen Keller
Coordinator
Franklin Learning Center
Franklin Community Library
Minneapolis Public Library
1314 E. Franklin Avenue
Minneapolis, MN 55404
Ph: 612-874-0951

Ms. Annette Salo
Director
Linking Libraries & Literacy for Lifelong Learning
St. Paul Public Library-Lexington Branch
1080 University Avenue
St. Paul, MN 55104
Ph: 612-292-6621
Fax: 612-292-6276
email: annettes@stpaul.lib.mn.us

Mr. Steve Sumerford
Director
Community of Readers
Glenwood Library
1901 West Florida Street
Greensboro, NC 27403
Ph: 910-297-5002

Ms. Jolene Hake
Executive Director
Platte Valley Literacy Association
Columbus Public Library
2504 14th Street
Columbus, NE 68601
Ph: 402-564-5196
Fax: 402-563-3378

Ms. Helen Wollny
Director
Basic Skills for Reading & ESL
Elizabeth Public Library
11 South Broad Street
Elizabeth, NJ 07202
Ph: 908-354-6060 x224 or 203
Fax: 908-354-5845

Mr. Joseph Alloway
Director
Literacy for Non-English Speakers
Paterson Free Public Library
250 Broadway
Paterson, NJ 07501
Ph: 201-357-3013

Ms. Valerie Moore
Director
LVA - Socorro County
Socorro Public Library
401 Park Street
Socorro, NM 87801
Ph: 505-835-4659

Ms. Marion Welch
Library Literacy Center
Prendergast Library
509 Cherry Street
Jamestown, NY 14701
Ph: 716-484-7135

Ms. Susan O'Connor
Director
Literacy Program
Brooklyn Public Library
Grand Army Plaza
Brooklyn, NY 11238
Ph: 718-780-7819
Fax: 718-783-1770

Ms. Diane Rosenthal
Program Director
Centers for Reading and Writing
Bloomingdale Branch
New York Public Library
150 West 100th Street
New York, NY 10025
Ph: 212-932-7893
Fax: 212-932-2421

Ms. Ellen Yates
Coordinator
Great Plains Literacy Council
Southern Prairie Library System
421 North Hudson
Altus, OK 73521
Ph: 405-477-2890

Ms. Ronda Lehew
Director
Moore Literacy Council
Cleveland County Library
225 South Howard
Moore, OK 73160
Ph: 405-794-7323
Fax: 405-793-8755

Ms. Paula Lane
Director
Literacy Council of LeFlore County
Buckley Public Library
408 Dewey Avenue
Poteau, OK 74953
Ph: 918-647-3833
Fax: 918-647-8910

Ms. Sandra Carrick
Director
LEARN Project
Eugene Public Library
100 West 13th Avenue
Eugene, OR 97401
Ph: 503-687-5450

Ms. Nancy Laskowski
Head
Reader Development Program
Free Library of Philadelphia
1901 Vine Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103
Ph: 215-686-5346
Fax: 215-686-5371
email: laskowski@hslc.org

Ms. Sherry Spencer
Bradford-Wyoming County Literacy Program
Bradford County Library
R.R. 3, Box 320
Troy, PA 16947
Ph: 717-297-3375
Fax: 717-297-4197
email: bcLpubLb@epix.net

Ms. Sandra Farnum
Director
LVA - Kent County, Inc.
Coventry Public Library
1672 Flat River Road
Coventry, RI 02816
Ph: 410-822-9100

Ms. Debra Spear
Coordinator
Library Literacy Program
Greenville County Library
300 College Street
Greenville, SC 29601
Ph: 803-242-5000x239
Fax: 803-235-8375

Ms. Jane Brody
Coordinator
LVA Literacy Project
The Sterling Municipal Library
Mary Wilbanks Avenue
Baytown, TX 77520
Ph: 713-427-7331
Fax: 713-420-5347

Ms. Mary Kaye Donahue-Hooker
Director
Library Literacy Center
El Paso Public Library
501 N. Oregon
El Paso, TX 79901
Ph: 915-543-5413

Ms. Jewett Powers
Director
Proyecto Adelante
Weslaco Public Library
525 South Kansas Avenue
Weslaco, TX 78596
Ph: 210-968-4533
Fax: 210-969-4069

Ms. Rhoda Goldberg
Assistant County Librarian
Director, Library Literacy Programs
Harris County Public Library
8080 El Rio Street
Houston, TX 77054-4195
Ph: 713-749-9011
Fax: 713-749-9090
email: rgoldberg@sparc.hpl.lib.tx.us

Ms. Kay Robbins
Director
Andrews Adult Literacy Program
Andrews Public Library
106 Northeast Avenue E Place
Andrews, TX 79714
Ph: 915-523-4007

Ms. Nadene Steinhoff
Director
Bridgerland Literacy
Logan Library
255 North Main Street
Logan, UT 84321
Ph: 801-753-5064

Ms. Joan Allen
Literacy Coordinator
Newport News Public Library
2510 Wickham Avenue
Newport News, VA 23607
Ph: 804-247-8677
Fax: 804-247-2321
email: jallen@leo.vsla.edu

Ms. Judy Fuller
Program Director
Project READ
Longview Public Library
1600 Louisiana Street
Longview, WA 98632
Ph: 360-577-3380

Mr. Peter Cole
Coordinator
Library Literacy Program/Lifelong Learning
Seattle Public Library
1000 4th Avenue
Seattle, WA 98104
Ph: 206-386-4661
email: pcole@spl.lib.wa.us

Ms. Judy Azulay
Director
Library Literacy Program
Monroe County and Peterstown Public Libraries
P.O. Box 558
Union, WV 24983
Ph: 304-772-3038
Fax: 304-772-4052

Ms. Carol Gabler
Executive Director
LVA - Chippewa Valley/Eau Claire
L.E. Phillips Memorial Public Library
400 Eau Claire Street
Eau Claire, WI 54701-3715
Ph: 715-834-0222
Fax: 715-839-3822
email: lva@cvec.wis

Even Anchors Need Lifelines:
The Background Data

Public Libraries In Adult Literacy

Volume II of
A Study by Gail Spangenberg
Spangenberg Learning Resources

New York City
August 1996

Sponsored by
The Center for the Book
in The Library of Congress

ABOUT THIS DATA BOOK

This publication is intended to serve as a companion to *Even Anchors Need Lifelines*, a study about the role and future of public libraries in adult literacy.

It is being made available by the Center for the Book in The Library of Congress as a reference for researchers and others who want to look more deeply at the study data than would be possible using the 51 tables of the main report alone. It may be especially useful to those who want to draw out information on a state or local basis, something that could not be done to a significant degree in the main report.

The thinking of the study participants—as will be seen from their own words in the narrative portions of the data—is wise, committed, sometimes ambivalent and fearful, poignant, and always thought-provoking. At all levels, these are people speaking as professionals, often with great candor, but the human dimensions come through as well. To journey deeply into parts of the data book will be rewarding and immensely humbling.

The four groups involved in the survey were: Chief officers of state library agencies (Q1), key literacy contacts in state libraries (Q2), heads of state literacy resource centers (SLRCs, Q3), and heads of local public library literacy programs (Q4).

The data book is organized into the eight topical sections of the survey, with each section introduced by its own Contents page. The Contents page indicates the questions of that section as well the survey groups to which particular questions were addressed. Preceding the sections is a single page showing the study participants on a state-by-state basis for each of the four categories surveyed.

0. Questionnaire Respondees (p. 1)
1. Role of Public Libraries (p. 3)
2. Technology (p. 69)
3. Planning (p. 121)
4. Finance (p. 151)
5. General (p. 207)
6. Library Agency Program Data (p. 245)
7. About Your Library Literacy Program (p. 265)
8. The Library Culture (p. 295)

Gail Spangenberg

Questionnaire Respondees

	Q1-State Librarians			Q2-State Library Literacy Contacts		Q3-Heads State Lit Resource Centers		Q4-Local Library Literacy Programs		
	Yes	SAQ2	NR	Yes	NR	Yes	NR	Nom.	Yes	NR
Alabama AL	1				1	1		*2*	1	1
Alaska AK			1	1		1				
Arkansas AR	1			1			1	*2*	2	
Arizona AZ			1		1	1				
California CA		1		1		1		*6*	5	1
Colorado CO		1		1		1		*1*	1	
Connecticut CT			1	1		1		*2*	1	1
DC	1				1		1			
Delaware DE	1			1		1		*2*	2	
Florida FL	1			1		1		*6*	6	
Georgia GA	1			1			1	*3*	3	
Hawaii HI	1			1		1				
Iowa IA	1			1		1				
Idaho ID	1			1			1			
Illinois IL	1			1		1		*4*	3	1
Indiana IN	1			1		1		*3*	3	
Kansas KS	1			1		1		*3*	1	2
Kentucky KY	1			1		1				
Louisiana LA		1		1		1				
Massachusetts MA		1		1			1	*6*	4	2
Maryland MD	1			1		1		*2*	1	1
Maine ME	1			1			1			
Michigan MI	1			1		1		*1*	1	
Minnesota MN	1			1		1		*2*	2	
Missouri MO		1		1		1				
Mississippi MS	1			1		1				
Montana MT	1			1		1				
North Carolina NC			1		1	1		*1*	1	
North Dakota ND	1			1		1		*1*		1
Nebraska NE	1			1		1		*1*	1	
New Hampshire NH	1			1		1				
New Jersey NJ	1			1		1		*4*	2	2
New Mexico NM	1			1		1		*2*	1	1
Nevada NV	1				1		1			
New York NY		1		1		1		*5*	3	2
Ohio OH	1			1		1		*1*		1
Oklahoma OK		1		1		1		*3*	3	
Oregon OR	1			1			1	*1*	1	
Pennsylvania PA	1			1		1		*2*	2	
Rhode Island RI	1				1		1	*1*	1	
South Carolina SC		1		1		1		*1*	1	
South Dakota SD	1			1		1				
Tennessee TN	1			1		1				
Texas TX	1			1			1	*5*	5	
Utah UT	1				1	1		*1*	1	
Vermont VT		1		1		1				
Virginia VA		1		1		1		*2*	1	1
Washington WA		1		1		1		*2*	2	
West Virginia WV	1			1		1		*3*	1	2
Wisconsin WI	1			1		1		*1*	1	
Wyoming WY		1		1			1			
TOTALS	35	12	4	44	7	40	11	*82*	63	19
Resp.Rate %	69	24	8	86	14	78	22	*100*	77	23

*SQQ2 = Same As Q2 (state librarians indicated that agency literacy professional speaks for them)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CONTENTS - Role of Public Libraries

R1	Should the provision of literacy services be a major mission of public libraries? (Q1, Q2, Q3, Q4)
R2	Are public library literacy programs a major component of your state's literacy-providing network now? (Q3, Q4 only)
R3	Is the development of library-based adult literacy programs a major mission of the state library agency now? (Q1, Q2, Q3, Q4)
R3a	If library-based literacy programs are NOT a major mission of the state agency now, please explain why and indicate if and when the agency plans to adopt or expand library literacy programming? (Q1, Q2, Q3, Q4)
R4	In general, do you think that provision of literacy services in public libraries in the future should be more important, less important, or about the same as now? (Q1, Q2, Q3, Q4)
R5	Given your view of literacy needs and services in the state, what new or expanded role might public libraries play to help meet the needs? Conversely, what role might be inappropriate for them because other organizations are better suited to it? (Q3, Q4 only)
R6a	How well do you think **librarians** in your state understand the potential role of libraries as education/literacy service providers? (Q1, Q2, Q3, Q4)
R6b	How well do you think **state and national legislative and funding entities** understand the potential role of libraries as education/literacy service providers? (Q1, Q2, Q3, Q4)
R6c	How well do you think **literacy and education professionals in your state** understand the potential role of libraries as education/literacy service providers? (Q1, Q2, Q3, Q4)
R6d	If you answered "Not Well Enough" for any of these three groups, what suggestions do you have for ways to improve the understanding? (Q1, Q2, Q3, Q4)
R7	What do you personally see as the economic and social value(s) of library literacy programs? (Q1, Q2, Q4 only)
R8	What benefits do libraries themselves get from providing library literacy programs (e.g. increased patronage, higher circulation figures, greater community visibility/support, cultivation of adult readers as new clientele)? (Q1, Q2 only)

Should the provision of literacy services be a major mission of public libraries?																R1
		Q1				Q2				Q3				Q4		
	Yes	No	N.S.	No R	Yes	No	N.S.	No R	Yes	No	N.S.	No R	Yes	No	N.S.	No R
Alabama AL		1							1				1			
Alaska AK					1				1							
Arkansas AR		1				1							1	1		
Arizona AZ									1							
California CA					1				1				5			
Colorado CO					1					1			1			
Connecticut CT					1					1			1			
DC	1															
Delaware DE		1			1				1				2			
Florida FL	1				1				1				5	1		
Georgia GA			1					1					3			
Hawaii HI	1				1						1					
Iowa IA		1			1				1							
Idaho ID	1						1									
Illinois IL	1				1				1				3			
Indiana IN	1				1				1				3			
Kansas KS	1				1					1				1		
Kentucky KY	1				1				1							
Louisiana LA					1				1							
Massachusetts MA					1								4			
Maryland MD		1				1			1				1			
Maine ME	1							1								
Michigan MI	1							1	1					1		
Minnesota MN	1				1				1				2			
Missouri MO					1						1					
Mississippi MS	1				1				1							
Montana MT	1				1				1							
North Carolina NC												1	1			
North Dakota ND	1				1				1							
Nebraska NE		1						1			1				1	
New Hampshire NH	1							1			1					
New Jersey NJ	1				1				1				2			
New Mexico NM		1					1		1				1			
Nevada NV	1															
New York NY					1				1				2		1	
Ohio OH	1				1				1							
Oklahoma OK					1				1				3			
Oregon OR		1			1								1			
Pennsylvania PA		1						1				1	2			
Rhode Island RI			1										1			
South Carolina SC							1			1			1			
South Dakota SD	1				1				1							
Tennessee TN	1				1				1							
Texas TX	1						1						5			
Utah UT			1						1				1			
Vermont VT					1					1						
Virginia VA								1	1				1			
Washington WA					1				1				2			
West Virginia WV	1				1					1			1			
Wisconsin WI	1				1				1				1			
Wyoming WY						1										
Totals	23	9	3	0	30	3	4	7	28	6	4	2	57	4	2	0
				35				44				40				63
% of Respondees	*66*	*26*	*9*		*81*	*8*	*11*		*74*	*16*	*11*		*91*	*6*	*3*	

Are public library literacy programs a major component of your state's literacy-providing network now?																R2
		Q1				Q2				Q3				Q4		
	Yes	No	N.S.		Yes	No	N.S.		Yes	No	N.S.	NoR	Yes	No	N.S.	NoR
Alabama AL									1				1			
Alaska AK									1							
Arkansas AR													1	1		
Arizona AZ									1							
California CA									1				5			
Colorado CO										1			1			
Connecticut CT										1			1			
DC																
Delaware DE											1		2			
Florida FL									1				4	1	1	
Georgia GA													1	2		
Hawaii HI										1						
Iowa IA									1							
Idaho ID																
Illinois IL									1				3			
Indiana IN									1				1		2	
Kansas KS										1			1			
Kentucky KY									1							
Louisiana LA									1							
Massachusetts MA													3	1		
Maryland MD										1				1		
Maine ME																
Michigan MI									1					1		
Minnesota MN										1			1	1		
Missouri MO										1						
Mississippi MS										1						
Montana MT									1							
North Carolina NC									1					1		
North Dakota ND										1						
Nebraska NE										1					1	
New Hampshire NH										1						
New Jersey NJ									1				1	1		
New Mexico NM									1				1			
Nevada NV																
New York NY									1					2	1	
Ohio OH											1					
Oklahoma OK									1				3			
Oregon OR													1			
Pennsylvania PA												1	1	1		
Rhode Island RI													1			
South Carolina SC										1					1	
South Dakota SD												1				
Tennessee TN									1							
Texas TX													3		2	
Utah UT										1			1			
Vermont VT										1						
Virginia VA									1				1			
Washington WA										1				2		
West Virginia WV										1			1			
Wisconsin WI									1					1		
Wyoming WY																
Totals									20	16	2	2	39	16	8	0
												40				63
% of Respondees									*53*	*42*	*5*		*62*	*25*	*13*	

Is the development of library-based adult literacy programs a major mission of the state library agency now? R3

	Q1				Q2				Q3				Q4			
	Yes	No	N.S.	NoR	Yes	No	N.S.	NoR	Yes	No	N.S.	NoR	Yes	No	N.S.	NoR
Alabama AL		1									1				1	
Alaska AK						1			1							
Arkansas AR		1				1							1	1		
Arizona AZ											1					
California CA					1				1				5			
Colorado CO						1				1				1		
Connecticut CT					1					1					1	
DC	1															
Delaware DE		1				1					1			2		
Florida FL	1				1				1				3	2	1	
Georgia GA		1						1						3		
Hawaii HI	1						1				1					
Iowa IA		1				1				1						
Idaho ID	1						1									
Illinois IL	1				1				1				3			
Indiana IN	1				1					1			1		2	
Kansas KS	1				1						1			1		
Kentucky KY	1				1				1							
Louisiana LA					1				1							
Massachusetts MA					1								4			
Maryland MD		1				1				1				1		
Maine ME	1							1								
Michigan MI	1							1	1					1		
Minnesota MN	1							1		1					2	
Missouri MO					1					1						
Mississippi MS		1				1				1						
Montana MT		1				1				1						
North Carolina NC										1				1		
North Dakota ND		1				1				1						
Nebraska NE		1						1		1					1	
New Hampshire NH	1							1		1						
New Jersey NJ			1			1			1				1		1	
New Mexico NM		1				1			1				1			
Nevada NV	1															
New York NY					1				1					3		
Ohio OH	1				1					1						
Oklahoma OK					1				1				3			
Oregon OR		1			1								1			
Pennsylvania PA		1						1				1		1	1	
Rhode Island RI	1													1		
South Carolina SC						1				1					1	
South Dakota SD			1					1				1				
Tennessee TN	1					1				1						
Texas TX		1			1								3		2	
Utah UT		1								1				1		
Vermont VT					1					1						
Virginia VA						1				1				1		
Washington WA						1				1			2			
West Virginia WV	1				1					1			1			
Wisconsin WI	1				1						1			1		
Wyoming WY						1										
Totals	18	15	2	0	18	16	2	8	11	21	6	2	29	21	13	0
				35				44				40				63
% of Respondees	*51*	*43*	*6*		*50*	*44*	*6*		*29*	*55*	*16*		*46*	*33*	*21*	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

If library-based literacy programs are NOT a major mission of your state agency now, please explain why and indicate if and when your agency plans to adopt or expand library literacy programming.

R3a
(1)

State Librarians

Alabama AL	We support literacy programs through sub-grants to public libraries with federal funds, some training/awareness programs, and collection development grants. Our mission is providing information, supporting local public libraries, training in information and librarianship, not the direct provision of education.
Arkansas AR	Lack of funds.
Delaware DE	Library literacy programming has not been a top priority of library funding agents at either the state or federal level.
Georgia GA	Literacy is a part of our LSCA long-range plan. It is only one of the many eligible activities that library systems may use as a basis for their LSCA grant applications. Given the level of control in state, we'll probably never have a long range plan just for literacy.
Iowa IA	The provision of literacy services in Iowa is part of the mission of community colleges. Public libraries provide meeting places and support material for such programs. I do not expect the State Library of Iowa to increase its involvement in literacy programs.
Maryland MD	N.R.
Mississippi MS	The Library Commission is in the planning stages of conducting a planning a role-setting project for the agency. I do not feel tha I can address this situation at this time.
Montana MT	Insufficient resources to do this well.
Nebraska NE	We participate in literacy initiatives, assisting and promoting the work of other state and local groups in literacy programming.
New Mexico NM	N.R.
North Dakota ND	N.R.
Oregon OR	We have been fairly active with two statewide LSCA Title VI funded projects completed, but it is not "a major mission."

Pennsylvania PA	The state agency encourages public library participation in collaborative activities. Philosophically, Commonwealth libraries believe other agencies are better able to provide direct instructional services. Nor is funding available to undertake this mission.
Texas TX	Literacy has not been a major focus of programs at the Texas State Library. In part that is a reflection of resource scarcity, in part a question of constituent priorities, in part a result of the other agency initiatives in Texas. Most of our interest is with children's literacy.
Utah UT	Utah has one of the highest literacy rates in the nation. We have provided LSCA grants to libraries addressing specific community needs.

If library-based literacy programs are NOT a major mission of the state agency now, please explain why and indicate if and when the agency plans to adopt or expand library literacy programming.

State Library Literacy Contacts

Alaska AK	N.R.
Arkansas AR	Lack of funds.
Colorado CO	N.R.
Delaware DE	Delaware is a small state with very limited library resources
Iowa IA	Our agency supports the work of the Iowa Literacy Resource Center, but has a very limited level of participation in literacy programs.
Maryland MD	N.R.
Mississippi MS	The agency is beginning the process of an extensive planning and role setting project; therefore, this question cannot be answered at this time.
Montana MT	Insufficient resources to do this well.
North Dakota ND	N.R.
New Jersey NJ	Lack of staff and funding; our bureau shrank from 25 people to 7 people in the past five years.
New Mexico NM	We do administer state funding to the New Mexico Coalition for Literacy ($350,000 a year) to support the Coalition's development of community literacy programs. The majority of these are not based in libraries although many do cooperate with them and a few started as library projects and developed enough stature to become "independent."
South Carolina SC	However, we have a sizeable collection of literacy video tapes as well as an extensive collection of literacy materials in book format.
Tennessee TN	We are a support to adult education and we are committed to that aspect.

Virginia VA	N.R.
Washington WA	I've included the library's long-range literacy plan. It is out of date, unfortunately. In its last needs assessment, the State Library found that assistance with and leadership on literacy issues was a low priority. As a result, less emphasis has been placed on library literacy issues at a statewide level. However, a staff member of the state library still represents libraries on a statewide advisory council on adult education.
Wyoming WY	N.R.

If library-based literacy programs are NOT a major mission of the state library agency now, please explain why and indicate if and when the agency plans to adopt or expand library literacy programming.

R3a
(3)

State Literacy Resource Centers (SLRCs)

Colorado CO	N.R.
Connecticut CT	I have not seen any proposals in writing for more literacy programs from the State Library. No legislative efforts are currently underway. The State Library has undergone massive budget cuts for at least five years, if not more. This would be the most significant reason for lack of literacy efforts.
Delaware DE	N.R.
Iowa IA	Interest by state library for next 5+ years targets identification of library resources statewide and use of technology in libraries.
Indiana IN	State director on “appropriate” boards/councils/coalitions but no sense of thrust to develop library literacy programs as much as give voice to existence.
Maryland MD	The state has in the past supported literacy programs strongly. Over the past couple of years the emphasis has been to return to library's original mission and goal --to provide the public with information and resources only.
Minnesota MN	Budget cuts. There was previously (four years ago) a full-time staff person devoted to library literacy collaboration. When that person retired, the position was combined with another and never rehired.
Missouri MO	Lack of funding to expand.
Mississippi MS	N.R.
Montana MT	Lack of sufficient resources, primarily staff. The agency plans to move out of its role of statewide coordination.
North Carolina NC	Competing demands for limited resources.
North Dakota ND	N.R.
Nebraska NE	Not a major mission but does have a consistent and strong effort.
New Hampshire NH	I believe the library's mission to develop programs is constrained by lack of funding.

Ohio OH	Though not a "major" mission, there is commitment by some personnel in the State Library to expand literacy involvement.
South Carolina SC	N.R.
Tennessee TN	This is a commitment of the State Library.
Utah UT	(1) The demand for and complexity of literacy training would overwhelm libraries. Significant physical plant changes would need to occur. Additional "trained staff" would need to be hired. (2) We can both (libraries and SLRC's) do a better job of synergizing our resources. Our SLRC has established a working arrangement with a nearby county library. It has benefited them, us, and clients. (3) Our 4,500-item collection of materials is so different than the library's. (4) Cataloging systems would need to be altered to maximize student and literacy provider usage.
Vermont VT	The primary direct service mission belongs to service provider groups, which should be supported by the libraries. In Vermont, the Department of Labor needs to support regional and local libraries in becoming as strong as possible. There are not resources for broadening the mission of the library system.
Virginia VA	Because the State Library also suffered major cuts they have deleted from the budget this aspect of their work.
Washington WA	Despite the 1989 Governor's Conference on Library & Information Services' ranking adult literacy at the top of list of recommendations, adult literacy has not been a push by the State Library. Technology seems to be the shining star.
West Virginia WV	Frankly, I believe that those on the state level use this issue to try and secure more funding.

If [you think] library-based literacy programs are NOT a major mission of the state library agency now, please explain why and indicate if and when the agency plans to adopt or expand library literacy programming.

R3a
(4)

Local Programs

Arkansas AR	N.R. (Literacy Council of Hot Springs County)
Colorado CO	State library receives little or no literacy service money. Colorado legislature gives no money to adult education. State library signed an LSCA grant for a state literacy (library) coordinator, but that position will probably end with the end of LSCA grants. (Literacy Program, Mesa County Public Library District)
Delaware DE	At White House Conferences held around the state, literacy was at the bottom of the list. State library doesn't have any specifics for literacy written into their plan. There is no one at the state office that works with the other county literacy programs. Have been told that literacy is not a State library priority. (Project Reads: Sussex County Literacy Council) The Delaware State Division of Libraries is supportive of the four library-based volunteer literacy programs but does not make that a major mission. If more funding was available, greater emphasis may be adopted. (LVA-Wilmington Library)
Florida FL	N.R. (Project LEAD, Miami-Dade Public Library System) Federal cutbacks. Political climate--Barbara Bush is no longer in office. (Hillsborough Literacy Council, Tampa-Hillsborough County Library System)
Georgia GA	The State Library is undergoing major reorganization due to financial cuts and "redirection." As a result, survival seems to be the key issue. Literacy services have been considered a local issue rather than a State Library effort. Now, there seems to be a move toward the development of a statewide plan for public libraries/literacy. Because literacy is under the purview of the Department of Technical and Adult Education, collaboration will be required. The State Library could become a contributor, but only if this service becomes visible and viable. ((Learning Center, Athens-Clarke County Public Library) N.R. (Sara Hightower Regional Library) Georgia's state library agency is coping with major cutbacks and reorganization; since it has no authority to mandate services, it only offers advice and assistance when asked. (DeKalb County Public Library)

Kansas KS	Providing literacy services is not a major mission of the State Library but an important initiative. The State Library reviews all LSCA VI literacy grant requests and oversees the distribution of $200,000 in state funds to promote basic literacy education in Kansas. (Literacy Partnership, Johnson County Library)
Maryland MD	Responsibility is being given over to education institutions or private nonprofits. (Project Literacy, Howard County Library, Columbia)
Michigan MI	Our state literacy agency is housed in the state library building, but does not receive any funding from the library budget to staff this program. It does, however, provide office space as in-kind which is a cost-saving element for the literacy agency. (MARC Literacy Program, Greenville Public Library)
North Carolina NC	N.R. (Community of Readers, Glenwood Library)
New York NY	Low priority. New York State Library has a representative or liaison who advocates for literacy programs in libraries. Our representative is Maureen Read but to my knowledge there is no money in the budget to send her here to see us. (Library Literacy Center of Prendergast Library) The State Library supports the program by supporting grant applications to LSCA and offering grants. However, there is little or no input regarding quality of service provisions. (Literacy Program, Brooklyn Public Library) N.R. (Centers for Reading and Writing, New York Public Library)
Pennsylvania PA	The State Library of PA encourages participation of local public libraries in literacy programming or collaborative efforts with other agencies; however, it does not put LSCA funds into literacy directly. Although the State Library sees literacy as part of its mission, it is not focusing on literacy at this time because LSCA funds are so limited. The State Library supports the administration of AdvancE, the State Literacy Resource Center, and the LSCA administrator serves on the board of the PA State Coalition for Adult Literacy. (Bradford-Wyoming County Literacy Program, Bradford County Library)
Rhode Island RI	N.R. (LVA Kent County Inc., Coventry Public Library)
Utah UT	Years ago they provided seed money for new literacy programs. Those federal funds are gone. They are not currently involved in library literacy efforts. (Bridgerland Literacy, Logan Library)
Virginia VA	Literacy position at State Library was eliminated several years ago. (Newport News Public Library)

Wisconsin WI	Libraries in Wisconsin haven't had the staff to promote literacy services. The technical colleges here provide 80% of adult literacy services. Partnerships at the state level must be strengthened. Many local partnerships exist. (LVA Chippewa Valley/Eau Claire, L.E.Phillps Memorial Library)

In general, do you think that provision of literacy services in public libraries in the future															R4	
should be:																
		Q1				Q2				Q3				Q4			
	MI	LI	Same	N.R.	MI	LI	Same	N.R.	MI	LI	Same	N.R.	MI	LI	Same	N.R.	MI=More Important
Alabama AL			1						1						1		LI=Less Important
Alaska AK					1				1								Same=About the
Arkansas AR			1				1						2				same as now
Arizona AZ									1								N.R.=No Response
California CA					1				1				3		2		
Colorado CO					1				1				1				
Connecticut CT					1					1			1				
DC	1																
Delaware DE			1		1				1				1		1		
Florida FL			1		1				1				5		1		
Georgia GA	1				1								3				
Hawaii HI	1				1				1								
Iowa IA			1		1				1								
Idaho ID	1				1												
Illinois IL	1				1				1				2		1		
Indiana IN	1						1		1				3				
Kansas KS	1				1					1					1		
Kentucky KY			1				1		1								
Louisiana LA							1		1								
Massachusetts MA					1								4				
Maryland MD		1					1		1				1				
Maine ME	1							1									
Michigan MI			1					1	1				1				
Minnesota MN			1					1	1				2				
Missouri MO					1							1					
Mississippi MS	1				1				1								
Montana MT			1		1						1						
North Carolina NC											1		1				
North Dakota ND	1				1				1								
Nebraska NE	1							1	1						1		
New Hampshire NH	1							1			1						
New Jersey NJ	1				1						1		2				
New Mexico NM			1					1			1		1				
Nevada NV	1																
New York NY					1				1				3				
Ohio OH	1				1				1								
Oklahoma OK					1				1				3				
Oregon OR			1		1								1				
Pennsylvania PA			1					1				1	1		1		
Rhode Island RI	1												1				
South Carolina SC							1				1		1				
South Dakota SD	1				1							1					
Tennessee TN	1				1				1								
Texas TX	1						1						4		1		
Utah UT			1								1		1				
Vermont VT					1					1							
Virginia VA								1	1				1				
Washington WA					1				1				2				
West Virginia WV	1				1					1			1				
Wisconsin WI	1				1				1				1				
Wyoming WY					1												
Totals	21	1	13	0	29	0	7	8	26	4	7	3	53	0	10	0	
				35				44				40				63	
% of Total Responds	*60*	*3*	*37*		*81*	*0*	*19*		*70*	*11*	*19*		*84*	*0*	*16*		

16

Given your view of literacy needs and services in the state, what new or expanded role might public libraries play to help meet the needs? Conversely, what role might be inappropriate for them because other organizations are better suited to it?

R5 (3)

SLRCs

Alabama AL	Libraries should be integrated into literacy with respect to State Department of Education, if they are the major delivery system. In Alabama, they are. We do not need to fund them separately but integrate into current system. Otherwise duplication will become a major obstacle.
Alaska AK	Sponsor some volunteer programs. Coordinate with regional literacy program. Provide appropriate instructional materials.
Arizona AZ	Training - OCCC for SLRC resource rooms and online services.
California CA	Libraries provide value service, especially to adults who need one-on-one or small group services. Also much better at promotion and recruitment of hard-to-reach ABE adults. All libraries should provide family literacy and they are the only lifelong learning institution for all ages and are thus better suited to this role. Libraries should not be overly involved in classroom style literacy unless no other agency in their community is providing this.
Colorado CO	Libraries can provide reading materials at all reading levels and can cooperate with literacy providers by offering library orientation to new readers, space for tutoring classes, materials to new readers, and programs for new readers, especially those in family literacy programs.
Connecticut CT	Expand the role of housing and circulating collections of literacy materials. Training and tutoring should be left to literacy organizations and adult education programs.
Delaware DE	Provide more hands-on computers--e.g. take-home laptops; collections of adult theme books for beginning readers.
Florida FL	(Center closed due to lack of funding, but former director responded.) Public libraries have the potential to replace the FALRC functions. However, their resources are inadequate and unevenly distributed. Libraries in Florida serve many priority needs and while they have played an important role, given LSCA Titles I and VI, they could not participate without them. It would be inappropriate for libraries to provide direct instructional services if already provided by other effective organizations.
Hawaii HI	No Response (N.R.)
Iowa IA	Libraries should continue to serve as "neutral" tutor sites. Material purchases must remain limited due to budgets. However, through inter-library loan they can function to obtain needed/desired funds.

Illinois IL	Libraries, especially the public ones, could provide unlimited resources to literacy programs in the way of information, materials, and staff expertise. They make wonderful, non-threatening sites for literacy services and already perform many functions inherent in family literacy programs. Because of their function as information access, they could increase the opportunities to bring technology into literacy programs through computers, distance technology, and video collections both for instruction and the training of staff and volunteers. Literacy students need to recognize that learning is a lifelong process for all of us--libraries provide the opportunity for such learning. The issue once again is clear and honest communication between libraries and education to determine how they can best meet the needs of literacy students. Because communities and the respective agencies in those communities can differ so greatly, this communication must be developed and utilized on an individual community basis--THERE ARE NO STEREOTYPICAL ROLES FOR EITHER EDUCATION OR LIBRARIES.
Indiana IN	Computer services for strengthening library skills. Offering literacy programs if none available. Offering literacy programs to locate inside library.
Kansas KS	The role of libraries is best illustrated by Project Finish in Johnson County: The libraries partner with education professionals at the Adult Ed center at Johnson Co. Community College to provide space for literacy activities and volunteers to work with the trained professionals.
Kentucky KY	Online computers for public use. Public relations and advocacy. Space for literacy programs--administrative and instructional. Collection and cataloging development shared. Collaborative projects, pooling resources, personnel, and expertise.
Louisiana LA	Some parish (county) libraries are very active in Family Literacy Programs--with the assistance of funding from the Louisiana Endowment for the Humanities. Others (particularly in rural areas) do well to survive. In fact, until last year the position of State Supervisor of School Libraries remained unfilled for a decade.
Maryland MD	N.R.
Michigan MI	In my view, most (if not all) community based literacy programs should be directly tied (housed, linked) with the public library system. There are no inappropriate library roles in adult literacy.
Minnesota MN	Libraries, particularly through some of their children's services, can be another entry point for adults needing literacy services. Sometimes, libraries can provide a stigma-free location for literacy instruction. Librarians also have expertise in helping people learn information processing skills, but I don't think the librarians think of taking those skills to the literacy providers. I do think that libraries should plug into existing literacy providers rather than trying to start their own services. Cooperation/collaboration.

Missouri MO	Libraries could become the place where everyone goes to get information and so they would need to teach us all how to use technology in order to get information. Libraries should strive to be more user friendly.
Mississippi MS	Expanded or new role: Serve as stable trainers, linking into Resource Centers. Training of trainers.
Montana MT	Helping to build coalitions in which they are not necessarily the lead agency. I think libraries are still more appropriate for the nontraditional student who may not fit into the educational establishment. However, I admit I may be behind the times in my thinking on this issue; i.e. perhaps some more traditional educators are doing more to meet the needs of "nontraditional" students.
North Carolina NC	More linkage between library community and LCLRC. This would build on existing collaboration between NCLRC and the Literacy Committee of the NC Library Association (e.g. our presentation on NCLRC at the NCLA biennial conference).
North Dakota ND	The public libraries need to be full partners in the delivery of literacy services. The Library staff need to be trained in collaborative project implementation and sharing resources.
Nebraska NE	Continue to provide facilities use for groups or individual adult literacy learners and instructors. With funds becoming increasingly limited, access to such space will be increasingly important. Also well-positioned to contribute to the literacy/technology efforts nationally, and could serve as readily accessible sites for adult learners to access instructional technology, resources, etc., via the Internet. I would exercise caution in the use of librarians as adult instructors, at least without adequate preparation for this role. There is a great difference in working with literacy and children or youth, and working with adults. However, with training, they could be a much valued instructional resource.
New Hampshire NH	In this state, good, large collections for low level readers are not in place in most of the libraries. While this is not a new or expanded role for NH libraries, it is one which could continue to be pursued.
New Jersey NJ	N.R.
New Mexico NM	Space for tutoring, public information, housing of literacy materials, computer-assisted learning programs.
New York NY	N.R.
Ohio OH	Public libraries can serve as major force in encouraging collaboration among existing literacy agencies.
Oklahoma OK	N.R.

Pennsylvania PA	N.R.
South Carolina SC	Leadership roles should stay with local adult education/literacy program. In-kind services would be beneficial.
South Dakota SD	There is a need for all public libraries to be one of the "point" literacy organizations/agencies in all communities. Improve literacy skills in a community and everyone wins. The lobby and/or political aspect of literacy should be left to the private non-profit sector.
Tennessee TN	N.R.
Utah UT	(1) Logging our collection into their system. They were approached, but their staffing limitations prevented them from assisting us. (2) Letting us know what literacy materials they have as support to training conducted by literacy professionals. (3) Open library facilities 6pm to 10pm instruction all week long. (4) Alter dress codes to accept all students who have unique dress and demeanor standards. Inappropriate: Librarians are not trained "educators" per se. But only 10% of the eligible adults who could take advantage of adult education/literacy through high school completion/GED take advantage of adult education classes and services. Most of the 90% never want any form of education (schooling) given to them no matter who teaches them.
Vermont VT	New reader services/materials--more awareness. Family literacy program support. Collaborations with local schools, agencies, businesses.
Virginia VA	They can be partners with adult education and literacy organizations/programs run by the state or with nonprofit groups. Solicit input from SLRC regarding materials to procure and make available on loan to meet needs of beginning, intermediate and adult learners, and have good materials in adult education and workplace for practitioners to use for professional development.
Washington WA	In general, Washington is well served--at least 150 adult basic skills instructional providers. Libraries do not need to create or operate instructional programs (except perhaps in a few rural, underserved areas). Libraries should cooperate with providers, stock collections, provide tutoring space, be knowledgeable about referrals, support family literacy efforts in the community.
Wisconsin WI	Approximately 600,000 adults are functionally illiterate in Wisconsin. Almost 16,000 students drop out of high school each year while only about 5,000 GED credentials are issued--indicating that the population in need is growing at about 3 times the number of adults achieving what society now considers a baseline credential. Libraries can provide materials, locations for adult education programs, advocacy for literacy services, public information, etc. Libraries can be a catalyst for bringing together literacy providers, consumers of literacy services, business and industry, etc.
West Virginia WV	Those on the local level have been more attuned to literacy needs. They might become more involved in participating in training programs and providing tutoring on site.

Given your view of literacy needs and services in the state, what new or expanded role might public libraries play to help meet the needs? Conversely, what role might be inappropriate for them because other organizations are better suited to it?

R5 (4)

Local Programs

Alabama AL

Don't compete with but work with other literacy and educational programs that help adults with educational goals. Cooperation and communication with other programs provides a broader base to work with and referrals to and from programs where services will not be duplicated. (LVA-Anniston/Calhoun County, Anniston/Calhoun Public Library)

Arkansas AR

Public libraries need to be partners with local literacy councils and adult education providers. Adult education providers are better suited to this role than public libraries. Many believe a literacy council does not belong in-house at a library because of stigma attached to libraries and reading--why go there, that place is scary! Provision of library collection materials. Facilities for tutoring. Support of projects at local/county level. Referral/recruitment of students and tutors. Collaboration/cooperation of individual librarians with literacy program. (Literacy Council of Hot Spring County)

Provide increased collections appropriate to low level readers. Provide technology to assist in meeting individual learning needs. Provide staff equipped to deal with this population. Inappropriate: Job preparation. (Reading Together, Arkansas River Valley Libraries for Literacy)

California CA

I think the needs are best served by maintaining the current role. Ideally, an expanded role would include providing a drop-in homework/study center for the school-age population. (Literacy Program, Napa City County Library)

Libraries could expand the English classes to new immigrants (a role they have played for nearly a century). Unfortunately, in California, a state with a large number of immigrants, literacy legislation does not permit for English as a Second Language. Libraries could also expand their role with public schools and coordinate after-school tutoring in addition to homework centers. As informal institutions of education, libraries can expand their boundaries while schools collapse theirs to create greater community education. (Adult Literacy Program, Alameda County Library)

Libraries are best-suited for one-to-one and small-group tutoring. In California, libraries play a major role in the delivery of literacy services. However, we are only able to serve a fraction of the people who need our help. We need resources (both $$ and space) to serve more people. (Partners in Reading, San Jose Public Library)

Libraries, as information centers, might sponsor community forums and discussions and special presentations appropriate for their patrons. These events would add live discussion as another resource, along with printed material, cassettes, videos and databases. (Adult Literacy Program, Commerce Public Library)

New: Coordinate funding efforts with Departments of Education and Library. (LVA Marin County, San Rafael Public Library)

Colorado CO

Libraries have been advertised nationally as sources of information on literacy services. As block grants to states come into being, state libraries should be on the front line requesting educational funds to continue library literacy and even begin needed programs not available elsewhere. [However], can't be welfare organizations--referral to other agencies for mental health, homeless, food and shelter, legal aid, etc. (Literacy Program, Mesa County Public Library District)

Connecticut CT

Librarians need training in awareness of literacy providers. (LVA-Greater Waterbury, Silas Bronson Library)

Delaware DE

The libraries should at least be advocates for literacy. The libraries should also be sympathetic and supportive to adult new readers who try to access library services. Providing tutoring space and materials is another role public libraries should play. (LVA-Wilmington Library)

N.R. (Project Reads: Sussex County Literacy Council, Sussex County Department of Libraries)

Florida FL

The public schools are addressing the needs of ABE students, but still have classes that are too large. They are in a better position to address teaching adults to read, but seem to have little idea of how to teach adults using various teaching techniques to reach people who do not learn in lecture-type situations. Perhaps public libraries could do more for more adult learners by providing testing services that gave prescriptions for each learner's style of learning. Then that student would be empowered by knowing he/she can learn to read; and teachers would know what special helps each student would need to learn to read. Additionally, adult learners could be grouped according to learning style and would benefit in larger numbers than public libraries can reach with one-on-one tutoring. (Project LEAD, Miami-Dade Public Library System)

Roles--more or expanded: More PR to support literacy organizations, better networking. Incorporation of a "literacy department." Tutor training.
Roles--inappropriate: Direct motivation by library staff. (Hillsborough Literacy Council, Tampa-Hillsborough County Library System)

Need family literacy expanded.
Tutoring those with disabilities, such as dyslexia, should be a school responsibility, not a [library responsibility].
(Panhandle Library Literacy Consortium, Jefferson County Public Library)

Since working in the literacy field for more than a decade, I have observed that there is not a State or County organization that addresses the needs of students with a reading level of below fourth grade. Students with learning disabilities also seem to be ignored. These students contact our library based literacy program for help. With additional funding libraries could expand services to this group of people. (Literacy Program, Brevard County Library)

Any certifying, curriculum driven, authoritarian provision is better done by the schools. (Each One, Teach One, Broward County Public Library)

One of the surprising discoveries of the NALS survey was that a large percentage of those at Levels 1 and 2 did not feel they needed to improve their basic skills. Literacy providers know they are reaching a very small percentage of those who may need help. One role the public libraries could play is to institute a continuous public awareness campaign targeted to those who need to improve collaborative programs with other literacy providers. These linkages will need to be strengthened in the future to make the best use of the limited funds available. More attention will need to be given to English as a Second Language, especially in training literacy staff and volunteers to work with this population. (Center for Adult Learning, Jacksonville Public Libraries)

Georgia GA

Public libraries recognize the importance of technology and what it can do to help integrate adult new readers into today's society. Libraries offer the vehicle for linking students to newer media/information. The availability of computers means access to the Internet where a vast array of literacy offerings can be found. Access to a satellite dish opens the opportunity for distance learning, staff development through video-conferencing, and other literacy related programs. Public libraries, with all the resources now available, are the ultimate lifelong learning resource. Inappropriate: Because of limited or lack of funding, staff development may best be left to other organizations. (Learning Center, Athens-Clarke County Public Library)

N.R. (Literacy Program, Sara Hightower Regional Library)

As we have done in Metro-Atlanta, libraries can act as a catalyst for coalition building, promoting cooperation among all members of the literacy community. In communities with fewer available resources, the library might become a "One-Stop" center, offering comprehensive information and referral for all educational, employment, training and career services. Libraries need not duplicate instructional programs or services offered by other agencies and providers. (Literacy Program, DeKalb County Public Library)

Illinois IL

Provide office space for literacy organizations.
Local schools must improve their programs to elevate literacy skills while public libraries and literacy volunteer organizations do their share, or failing school systems will keep producing illiterate students on a continuing basis.
(LVA Elgin, Gail Borden Public Library)

More family literacy. (Family Literacy Partnership, Bensenville Library)

[Public libraries can help meet the needs in three areas]: Technology--online services, computer usage for tutoring/teaching. Outreach--referral/recruitment. Family Literacy. (Libraries for Literacy in Lake County, Waukegan Public Library)

Indiana IN

Public libraries should not only provide information, referral services, and adult new reader collections, but also individual tutoring if desired by patrons. It would be helpful for the library to also coordinate tutoring efforts with other community organizations, such as YMCAs or community centers, since many low-level readers feel intimidated coming into a library. Direct instruction in groups, however, might be better managed by schools or ABE organizations, particularly since libraries often lack 'classrooms' suitable for group instruction. Public libraries might also better publicize themselves as lifelong learning centers for persons of all ages. This would mean that children should receive literacy services as well as adults, since the public schools do not always meet the literacy needs of children (as we assume they do). (By "literacy need," I mean basic reading, writing, and math.) (Literacy Program, Michigan City Public Library)

Literacy needs and services throughout Indiana would benefit greatly from more inter-service cooperation. More informed referrals to the correct agency can only improve service to those who need it. Libraries can be wonderful sources for information so they need to have possession of current information as quickly as possible. Providing space for training, lessons, meetings, collections, information, special occasions is something libraries should do happily. The opportunities for teaching from the materials and the technology are mindboggling! (Literacy Program, Anderson Public Library)

Indiana IN (cont'd)	Libraries are ideally suited to provide reading, creative writing, and computer-based instruction. They already do a great job of this with children and young adults, and many can provide the same to adults with very little modification. Another area libraries are ideal for is simply fostering a love of reading through such avenues as community read-alouds and book discussion groups. Areas where libraries are inappropriate--because others do it better--include job training. (Knox County Literacy Program)
Kansas KS	Libraries and community colleges need to forge partnerships and pool their limited resources to better serve their community. An exemplary model of such a partnership is Project Finish in Overland Park, KS, which is jointly sponsored by both the Johnson Co. Library and the Johnson Co. Community College. (Literacy Program, Johnson County Library)
Massachusetts MA	Except for very limited funding, which affects all literacy services, libraries can be excellent places to support literacy with collections, space for tutoring programs, and direct instruction. It's a natural and often more positive location for adults who have not had success in schools to come to, to address their literacy needs. (Read Write/Now Program, Springfield City Library-Mason Square Branch) Voter registration. Providing classroom/office space to community-based organizations that offer literacy classes. Providing independent computer-assisted learning. Providing citizenship testing (a public library can be so much less intimidating than an INS office!). Hosting cultural events for local immigrant groups (dance performances, etc.). Summer native language literacy camp for kids. (Center for New Americans, Jones Library) The public library can be a central resource for the public schools, the Adult Education programs, Head Start and other agencies involved in literacy activities. Besides classes and special events for literacy, it can offer tours which acquaint literacy students, especially newcomers, with how to use the library to improve their lives. Inappropriate: I don't think libraries should offer courses which stress academics in a competitive sense. Instead they should seek and employ ways to allow adult learners to identify their needs and experiment without fear of failure. (Newcomer Family Literacy Project, Lawrence Public Library) Family literacy programs for a variety of age groups could be expanded in public libraries. One-on-one tutoring works very well in the library. Classes beyond survival level are available elsewhere, where they can be better managed. (Literacy Program, Thomas Crane Public Library)
Maryland MD	Enter into partnerships with other literacy providers as well as with the business community to expand services. Tutoring might be taken over by private nonprofit agencies. (Project Literacy, Howard County Library)
Michigan MI	The expanded role can be the link between the adult community, reading improvement, and library usage. Libraries can better meet the needs of adult new readers for 1-1 tutoring, flexible hours (day, evening, weekends), location, privacy and confidentiality. (MARC Literacy Program, Greenville Public Library)

Minnesota MN	Public libraries should provide access to Internet for users. They should provide a selection of CD ROM resources, home access to an online catalog (dial-in) and a full selection of new adult reader, GED, ESL materials. I do not feel libraries should provide tutors for literacy programs unless that service is not provided elsewhere in the community. I feel that is the role of the public school's adult education program and the library should be a complement to that program. Libraries should collaborate with existing literacy service providers in their area. Examples of the above are the Hamline project in St. Paul providing a collaboration with Twin Cities Freenet training users on the Internet at the Hamline Community Library. Another example is the Lexington collaborative with Hubbs described below. The branch librarian is on the Learning Center Advisory Board and the Center was built in this location to be near the existing public library. (Linking Libraries & Literacy for Lifelong Learning, Lexington Branch Library, St. Paul) New Readers & Multi-language collections. Improved referrals. Community computing centers with proper staff to introduce and guide public on Internet. Adult literacy centers (drop in) located in neighborhoods most often affected by literacy issues. (Franklin Learning Center, Franklin Community Library, Minneapolis Public Library)
North Carolina NC	Provide technology (GED software, Home Pages, etc.) for students. Collaborate with providers. Initiate and lead a community-wide coalition of literacy providers, stakeholders, etc. to promote reading and literacy. (Community of Readers, Glenwood Library)
Nebraska NE	Nebraska has pockets of need--particularly communities which are experiencing an influx of laborers who need literacy training. The state, through the legislature, needs to address the literacy training needs of those communities and assist with funding. (Platte Valley Literacy Association, Columbus Public Library)
New Jersey NJ	New roles -- Libraries might have a home page on the Internet where the home page for the libraries would describe their literacy programs. Inappropriate roles -- Teaching a class of learners of 30 people (no room for this) would be inappropriate. Tutoring learners for GED is not necessary since trained teachers do this in the adult school. (Basic Skills for Reading & ESL, Elizabeth Public Library) The role might expand its low-level literacy collection for students and tutors, reference materials for tutors, software for kids and adults, space for tutoring; spearhead closer ties between literacy service providers; and explore viable partnerships with local businesses to provide workplace literacy. (Literacy for Non-English Speakers, Paterson Free Public Library.)
New Mexico NM	Have more family literacy programs for adults, children, and families. (LVA-Socorro County, Socorro Public Library)

New York NY

Ideally, literacy services should be a function of our public school system but the schools do not seem to be doing the job. Libraries seem to be the next choice to offer adult education. Libraries with adequate teaching materials and a well developed volunteer tutoring program may nicely fill the voids in adult education left by inadequate public schools or other job training programs such as PIC. (Library Literacy Center of Prendergast Library)

Libraries are best situated to serve a population that will have to meet extraordinary demands on time, scheduling and making ends meet. Libraries provide a free atmosphere that encourages individual growth and the pursuit of knowledge. More classes. Libraries can become the place for adult basic education that is not specifically workplace oriented. Workplace training should be in other sites. (Literacy Program, Brooklyn Public Library)

Libraries need to be flexible enough to adapt to changes in legislation that are currently impacting on clients' ability to participate in literacy programs. Expanded hours of service and partnerships formed with social service agencies would provide clients attending library literacy programs with a comprehensive service mix and have a positive impact on library literacy programs' ability to attract and retain students. Family literacy programs need to become a standard component of library literacy programs. Resources and facilities, e.g. children's librarians, children's rooms, collections of materials ranging from pre-school to young adult, combined with the professional expertise of adult educators, and collections of materials for adult new readers, make libraries a natural site for these programs.

Oklahoma OK

Because public libraries are a center of activity in most communities, they are a logical site for adult literacy programming. They provide an atmosphere that encourages learning and growth. If a public library is going to truly serve its community, adult literacy needs to be a part of their services. (Moore Literacy Council, Cleveland County Library)

Public libraries might make an effort to merge their children's Reading Programs with family literacy programs targeting low reading level families. Also, as libraries acquire computers, literacy and ESL software programs could be added for either individual or one-on-one use. Inappropriate: Would be a duplication to set up computer labs or offer GED classes, although there is a place for short-term GED tutoring. (Great Plains Literacy Council, Southern Prairie Library System)

I think it would be advantageous if public libraries would delineate the position of literacy coordinator as a regular staff position. This would lend continuity to literacy programs. Statistics show that programs with paid, full-time directors do a much more efficient job of recruiting students and volunteers and maintaining programs. (Literacy Council of LeFlore County, Buckley Public Library)

Oregon OR

Most Oregon libraries find it difficult to organize language and math skills instruction for adults. We do have programs sponsored by the Oregon Office of Community College Services (OCCS) and Oregon Literacy Inc. that have the potential of reaching out to all areas of the state. They need the local collaboration of libraries to help recruit tutors and students, house books and materials, and provide space for tutoring when possible. Adult skills programs need cooperative efforts by business, employment services, adult and family services, education agencies, libraries, and schools. (LEARN Project, Eugene Public Library)

Pennsylvania PA

Public libraries can fulfill the role of networking organizations, providing public meeting places, coordination of literacy activities, facilitating discussions of issues and practices where no other such organization exists. Libraries should devote more effort and resources to purchasing books and AV materials that are relevant to adult learners' needs--not just recycled children's materials. (Reader Development Program, Free Library of Philadelphia)

Public libraries could assist with public awareness of literacy needs. Since volunteer literacy programs only reach 2-4% of those needing help with reading, more work is needed to make people aware of available services. An inappropriate role would be to duplicate existing services, such as GED or already existing literacy programs. (Bradford-Wyoming County Literacy Program, Bradford County Library)

Rhode Island RI

All libraries should have adult literacy materials available for circulation and should try to provide space for tutoring, workshops, etc. Not every library need have its own literacy program--libraries can coordinate joint programs. Schools should be more focused on childhood literacy, libraries on adult and family literacy. (LVA Kent County, Inc., Coventry Public Library)

South Carolina SC

I think that collaboration is the most efficient and sensible way for libraries to be involved with literacy. Provision of space, recruitment of tutors, purchase of materials too costly for small poor county literacy agencies, staff awareness, and a close contact with literacy providers, at least at a county level, are very valuable, cost effective, and appropriate. (Literacy Program, Greenville County Library)

Texas TX

Extend services to adults outside of the central library via bookmobile visits to schools and workplace literacy sites.
Encourage collaborative endeavors between literacy program and other library departments--e.g. young people, extension services, public information, etc.
Direct service to students under the age of 18 is inappropriate because schools are better suited to work with this age group (not mature enough to do independent work).
(LVA - Sterling Municipal Library)

Literacy needs outnumber the services available throughout Texas. Public libraries can and should play a part in meeting these needs by offering extensive literacy collections for new readers, by serving as resource centers for literacy service providers, and by providing adults the opportunity to improve their reading and writing skills through an educational component whether this be with volunteer tutors, computerized self-paced instruction or small group tutoring. Libraries do not have the money or personnel to serve as instructional institutions for adult learners, but rather can work in partnership with these agencies by offering their facilities for instruction. (Library Literacy Center, El Paso Public Library)

Provide space and materials. Support the other organizations by sharing information and materials. (Proyecto Adelante, Weslaco Public Library)

Perhaps more libraries could work closely with literacy providers in their communities to publicize volunteer literacy efforts; especially on special occasions such as International Literacy Day. (Literacy Programs, Harris County Public Library)

In my opinion, it seems that adults who had bad experiences are intimidated by returning to public schools for their education. The library provides a place where they can go with pride and less intimidation. I believe libraries should expand their adult programs for this reason. (Andrews Adult Literacy Program of Andrews Public Library)

Utah UT	In many rural areas of our state, the library is the only, or the most effective entity to sponsor or support literacy efforts. They have resources such as space, utilities, equipment, etc. They have community connections and expertise, often. The educational resources in our state are stretched even thinner than library resources, so libraries may be in a better position to assist literacy efforts. (Bridgerland Literacy, Logan Library)
Virginia VA	A continuation of adult literacy programs should remain available through libraries. Focusing on family literacy, I can see where the need for expanded storytime and even day care could play a pivotal role in library literacy programs. (Literacy Program, Newport News Public Library)
Washington WA	I believe that family literacy needs to be addressed in order to combat illiteracy, by training new parents to read to their children and to identify parents who need help to improve reading skills themselves. Libraries need to work in cooperation with other agencies who are providing health services to parents and children. (Project READ, Longview Public Library) I think a library literacy program should serve those least served--the new reader now enrolled in a community college program. (Library Literacy Program, Lifelong Learning, Seattle Public Library)
Wisconsin WI	Many libraries in Wisconsin provide space for literacy providers. This is a wonderful partnership because it requires no new staff for the library. Our library also helps with our RIF program for family literacy. (LVA Chippewa Valley/ Eau Claire, L.E. Phillips Memorial Public Library)
West Virginia WV	Family literacy programs in every library. Collections of workplace literacy materials. Collections of high-interest low vocabulary material. Space for tutoring. Curriculum development based on authentic materials. Literacy coordination, initiation, program development. (Literacy Program, Monroe County & Peterstown Public Libraries)

How well do you think librarians in your state understand the potential role of libraries as education/literacy service providers?

	Q1				Q2				Q3				Q4				R6a
	VW	NWE	DK	N.R.	VW	NWE	DK	N.R.	VW	NWE	DK	N.R.	VW	NWE	DK	N.R.	
Alabama AL	1									1			1				VW=Very Well
Alaska AK						1				1							NWE=Not Well Enough
Arkansas AR	1				1								2				DK=Don't Know
Arizona AZ									1								NR=No Response
California CA						1				1			2	3			
Colorado CO						1				1				1			
Connecticut CT					1				1					1			
DC		1															
Delaware DE		1				1					1			2			
Florida FL	1				1					1			3	3			
Georgia GA		1				1							1	2			
Hawaii HI		1				1					1						
Iowa IA	1				1					1							
Idaho ID		1				1											
Illinois IL		1				1				1			1	2			
Indiana IN		1			1					1			1	1	1		
Kansas KS		1				1				1					1		
Kentucky KY		1				1			1								
Louisiana LA					1					1							
Massachusetts MA						1							2	2			
Maryland MD	1				1					1				1			
Maine ME		1						1									
Michigan MI	1							1	1					1			
Minnesota MN		1				1				1			1	1			
Missouri MO						1				1							
Mississippi MS		1				1					1						
Montana MT	1				1				1								
North Carolina NC									1					1			
North Dakota ND		1				1				1							
Nebraska NE		1						1	1					1			
New Hampshire NH		1						1		1							
New Jersey NJ	1				1					1			1	1			
New Mexico NM	1				1				1				1				
Nevada NV		1															
New York NY						1			1					3			
Ohio OH		1				1					1						
Oklahoma OK					1					1			1	2			
Oregon OR	1				1									1			
Pennsylvania PA	1							1				1		2			
Rhode Island RI	1												1				
South Carolina SC						1					1				1		
South Dakota SD		1				1						1					
Tennessee TN		1				1					1						
Texas TX		1			1								4	1			
Utah UT	1									1				1			
Vermont VT					1					1							
Virginia VA								1		1			1				
Washington WA						1				1					2		
West Virginia WV	1				1					1				1			
Wisconsin WI	1				1				1					1			
Wyoming WY						1											
Totals	15	20	0	0	16	22	0	6	10	22	6	2	23	35	5	0	
				35				44				40				63	
% Total Responds	*43*	*57*	*0*		*42*	*58*	*0*		*26*	*58*	*16*		*36*	*56*	*8*		

How well do you think state and national legislative and funding entities understand the potential of libraries as education/literacy services providers?

	Q1				Q2				Q3				Q4				R6b
	VW	NWE	DK	NR	VW	NWE	DK	NR	VW	NWE	DK	NR	VW	NWE	DK	NR	
Alabama AL		1								1				1			VW=Very Well
Alaska AK						1				1							NWE=Not Well Enough
Arkansas AR		1				1								2			DK=Don't Know
Arizona AZ										1							NR=No Response
California CA						1				1			1	4			
Colorado CO							1			1				1			
Connecticut CT						1				1				1			
DC		1															
Delaware DE		1				1					1			2			
Florida FL		1			1					1				6			
Georgia GA		1				1								3			
Hawaii HI	1					1				1							
Iowa IA		1				1				1							
Idaho ID			1			1											
Illinois IL		1				1				1				3			
Indiana IN		1				1				1				3			
Kansas KS		1				1				1				1			
Kentucky KY		1				1				1							
Louisiana LA						1				1							
Massachusetts MA						1							1	3			
Maryland MD	1						1				1			1			
Maine ME		1						1									
Michigan MI		1						1	1					1			
Minnesota MN		1				1				1				1	1		
Missouri MO						1					1						
Mississippi MS		1				1					1						
Montana MT	1				1					1							
North Carolina NC											1			1			
North Dakota ND		1				1					1						
Nebraska NE		1						1		1				1			
New Hampshire NH		1						1		1							
New Jersey NJ		1					1			1				1	1		
New Mexico NM	1				1					1				1			
Nevada NV		1															
New York NY						1					1			2	1		
Ohio OH		1				1					1						
Oklahoma OK						1				1				3			
Oregon OR	1					1								1			
Pennsylvania PA	1							1				1		2			
Rhode Island RI		1												1			
South Carolina SC						1				1			1				
South Dakota SD		1				1						1					
Tennessee TN		1				1					1						
Texas TX		1				1								5			
Utah UT		1								1				1			
Vermont VT						1				1							
Virginia VA								1		1				1			
Washington WA						1				1				1	1		
West Virginia WV			1			1					1			1			
Wisconsin WI		1				1				1				1			
Wyoming WY						1											
Totals	6	27	2	0	3	32	3	6	1	27	10	2	3	56	4	0	
				35				44				40				63	
% Total Responds	*17*	*77*	*7*		*8*	*84*	*8*		*3*	*71*	*26*		*5*	*89*	*6*		

How well do you think literacy and education professionals in your state understand the potential role of libraries as education/literacy service providers?

R6c

	Q1				Q2				Q3				Q4				
	VW	NWE	DK	NR	VW	NWE	DK	NR	VW	NWE	DK	NR	VW	NWE	DK	NR	
Alabama AL	1									1				1			VW=Very Well
Alaska AK						1			1								NWE=Not Well Enough
Arkansas AR	1				1								1	1			DK=Don't Know
Arizona AZ									1								NR=No Response
California CA					1					1			3	2			
Colorado CO					1				1					1			
Connecticut CT					1					1			1				
DC	1																
Delaware DE		1				1					1		2				
Florida FL	1				1					1			2	4			
Georgia GA		1				1								3			
Hawaii HI		1				1			1								
Iowa IA		1			1				1								
Idaho ID		1			1												
Illinois IL		1			1					1			2	1			
Indiana IN		1			1					1			1	2			
Kansas KS		1				1				1			1				
Kentucky KY		1				1			1								
Louisiana LA						1				1							
Massachusetts MA						1							1	3			
Maryland MD	1					1			1				1				
Maine ME	1							1									
Michigan MI	1							1	1					1			
Minnesota MN		1				1				1			1	1			
Missouri MO						1					1						
Mississippi MS		1				1			1								
Montana MT		1				1					1						
North Carolina NC										1				1			
North Dakota ND	1					1			1								
Nebraska NE	1							1		1			1				
New Hampshire NH		1						1			1						
New Jersey NJ			1		1					1			1		1		
New Mexico NM	1				1				1				1				
Nevada NV		1															
New York NY						1				1				3			
Ohio OH	1				1						1						
Oklahoma OK					1					1			1	2			
Oregon OR	1				1									1			
Pennsylvania PA	1							1				1	1	1			
Rhode Island RI		1												1			
South Carolina SC						1			1				1				
South Dakota SD		1				1						1					
Tennessee TN	1					1					1						
Texas TX		1				1							2	3			
Utah UT	1									1				1			
Vermont VT						1			1								
Virginia VA								1		1			1				
Washington WA					1					1				2			
West Virginia WV	1					1			1					1			
Wisconsin WI		1				1			1					1			
Wyoming WY					1												
Totals	16	18	1	0	16	22	0	6	15	17	6	2	25	37	1	0	
				35				44				40				63	
% Total Responds	*46*	*51*	*3*		*42*	*58*	*0*		*39*	*45*	*16*		*40*	*59*	*1*		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

State librarians were asked how well librarians, state and national legislative and funding entities, and literacy and education professionals in their states understand the potential role of libraries as education/literacy service providers. Those indicating "Not Well Enough" were then invited to make suggestions on what steps might be taken to improve the understanding of any of the three groups. The ideas offered were: R6d

State Librarians (1)

	Libr	St/Natl Leg/$	St Lit/ Ed Pros	
Alabama AL		x		N.R.
Arkansas AR		x		Statewide publicity and marketing efforts would help legislative and funding entities become aware of the potential role of libraries as active participants with other literacy providers in reducing illiteracy.
District of Columbia DC	x	x		N.R.
Delaware DE	x	x	x	N.R.
Georgia GA	x	x	x	N.R.
Hawaii HI	x		x	N.R.
Iowa IA		x	x	N.R.
Idaho ID	x		x	N.R.
Illinois	x	x	x	[Literacy and education professionals] may know but don't accept.
Indiana IN	x	x	x	Continued emphasis on why low literacy skills of some of our citizens reduce our overall economic competitiveness. [Problem] holds back our development as a society and generally lowers the standard of living available to our children.
Kansas KS	x	x	x	N.R.
Kentucky KY	x	x	x	N.R.
Maine ME	x	x		N.R.
Michigan MI		x		N.R.
Minnesota MN	x	x	x	N.R.
Mississippi MS	x	x	x	N.R.
Montana MT			x	N.R.
North Dakota ND	x	x		N.R.
Nebraska NE	x	x		N.R.
New Hampshire NH	x	x	x	N.R.
New Jersey NJ		x		N.R.

Nevada NV	x	x	x	N.R.
Ohio OH	x	x		N.R.
Rhode Island RI		x	x	N.R.
South Dakota SD	x	x	x	N.R.
Tennessee TN	x	x		Outreach in communities is driven by individuals I levels of care and concern.
Texas TX	x	x	x	N.R:
Utah UT		x		N.R.
Wisconsin WI		x	x	N.R.

State library literacy contacts were asked how well librarians, state and national legislative and funding entities, and literacy and education professionals in their states understand the potential role of libraries as education/literacy service providers. Those indicating "Not Well Enough" were then invited to make suggestions on what steps might be taken to improve the understanding of any of the three groups. The ideas offered were:

State Library Literacy Contacts (2)

	Libr	St/Natl Leg/$	St Lit/ Ed Pros	
Alaska AK	x	x	x	N.R.
Arkansas AR		x		Statewide publicity and marketing efforts would help legislative and funding entities become aware of the potential role of libraries as active participants with other literacy providers in reducing illiteracy.
California CA	x	x		N.R.
Colorado CO	x			N.R.
Connecticut CT		x		N.R.
Delaware DE	x	x	x	N.R.
Hawaii HI	x	x	x	N.R.
Iowa IA		x		N.R.
Idaho ID		x	x	N.R.
Illinois IL	x	x	x	Utilizing the organizational structure of library systems, we've been making presentations and training interested librarians in how specifically they can be effective in providing literacy services. Our family literacy grant applications require the partnership of a library, an adult literacy program, and a child at risk agency in order to be funded. It is a constant marketing opportunity.
Indiana IN		x		N.R.
Kansas KS	x	x	x	N.R.
Kentucky KY	x	x	x	N.R.
Louisiana LA	x	x		N.R.
Massachusetts MA	x	x	x	N.R.
Maryland MD		x	x	N.R.
Minnesota MN	x	x	x	Clarify what literacy is. Clarify the library's domain as education. Develop a descriptive statement of purpose with the most thoughtful members of the library community. Keep the statement before the public for comment and discussion until all reach common ground.

Missouri MO	x	x	x	N.R.
Mississippi MS	x	x	x	[For] librarians and literacy/education professionals in state, improve understanding through librarians serving on councils of other literacy providers and by committing to community literacy services what the the library can offer. Communication would also contribute to improved understanding with state and national legislative/funding entities.
Montana MT			x	N.R.
North Dakota ND	x	x	x	N.R.
New York NY	x	x	x	N.R.
Ohio OH	x	x		N.R.
Oklahoma OK		x		N.R.
Oregon OR		x		N.R.
South Carolina SC	x	x	x	N.R.
South Dakota SD	x	x	x	N.R.
Tennessee TN	x	x	x	This depends on local leadership and personal understanding. Where it is good, it is good; where there is a lack of understanding, it isn't.
Texas TX		x	x	State and national legislative and funding entities have little knowledge of what public libraries provide to communities. This lack of knowledge is just beginning to change.
Vermont VT		x	x	National legislative bodies do not make as much of a connection as state ones do.
Washington WA	x	x		N.R.
Wisconsin WI		x	x	N.R.
West Virginia WV		x	x	N.R.
Wyoming WY	x	x		N.R.

Heads of SLRC's were asked how well librarians, state and national legislative and funding entities, and literacy and education professionals in their states understand the potential role of libraries as education/literacy service providers. Those indicating "Not Well Enough" were then invited to make suggestions on what steps might be taken to improve the understanding of any of the three groups. The ideas offered were:

	Libr	St/Natl Leg/$	St Lit/ Ed Pros	
Alabama AL	x	x	x	N.R.
Alaska AK	x	x		N.R.
Arizona AZ		x		N.R.
California CA	x	x	x	N.R.
Colorado CO	x	x		N.R.
Connecticut CT		x	x	N.R.
Delaware DE	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.R.
Florida FL	x	x	x	N.R.
Hawaii HI		x		N.R.
Iowa IA	x	x		N.R.
Illinois IL	x	x	x	N.R.
Indiana IN	x	x	x	Fund LBLP; publicize efforts.
Kansas KS	x	x	x	N.R.
Kentucky KY		x		N.R.
Louisiana LA	x	x	x	N.R.
Maryland MD	x			N.R.
Minnesota MN	x	x	x	They need to have a better sense of the education role that they play and how they can, if nothing else, model literacy provision through special collections. And don't forget the roles librarians can play in information literacy. Education professionals need to know they're not the only service providers.
Missouri MO	x			Many librarians are only interested in readers or "'users." They do not have training or expertise in teaching. If you want to change this, librarians must be sensitized and trained to work with non-readers.
Montana MT		x		N.R.
North Carolina NC			x	N.R.
North Dakota ND	x			N.R.

Nebraska NE		x	x	Wish we had a more concerted effort across the state to collaborate with other literacy efforts, particularly in terms of potential work with adult learners. Our library people seem terrific, and many good things are being done, but we continue to see a lack of a systematic, statewide effort to increase collaboration and cooperation between and among different literacy groups. At the state legislative level, I think there is little understanding of the potentials--there is such a tendency to gloss over adult literacy issues.
New Hampshire NH	x	x		N.R.
New Jersey NJ	x	x	x	N.R.
New Mexico NM		x		N.R.
New York NY			x	N.R.
Oklahoma OK		x		N.R.
South Carolina SC		x		N.R.
South Dakota SD	?	?	?	?
Tennessee TN				Every year librarians and ABE teachers come together for a joint staff development workshop. This is done on a limited basis (i.e. 10 librarians, 10 teachers). People involved in this program understand--and those who have had state library literacy grants are knowledgeable.
Utah UT	x	x	x	Develop master plans to exploit each other's resources to the advantage of clients. Discussion--to maximize resources and eliminate duplication.
Vermont VT	x	x		I think that libraries need to use their available resources to become the best library system possible and shoud support agencies providing direct services.
Virginia VA	x	x	x	(1) Hold at least 2 statewide meetings with good representation from [the three groups] and develop awareness of the need and of the importance of working collaboratively to achieve something of mutual benefit. (2) Invite said groups to meetings. (3) Encourage adult education/literacy and library people in partnership projects. (4) Membership on key statewide planning committees.
Washington WA	x	x	x	N.R.
Wisconsin WI		x		N.R.
West Virginia WV	x			N.R.

Local program heads were asked how well librarians, state and national legislative and funding entities, and literacy and education professionals in their states understand the potential role of libraries as education/literacy service providers. Those indicating "Not Well Enough" were then invited to make suggestions on what steps might be taken to improve the understanding of any of the three groups. The ideas offered were:

Local Library Literacy Programs

	Libr	St/Natl Leg/$	St Lit/ Ed Pros	
Alabama AL		x	x	N.R. (LVA Anniston Calhoun County, Anniston)
Arkansas AR		x		Arkansas Literacy Councils and Governor's Commission on Adult Literacy update our legislators. Staff and volunteers of Literacy Council of Hot Springs Co. (LCHSC) also correspond. Funding standards are difficult to measure up to with small literacy programs. Awareness of the administrative duties would be helpful. (Literacy Council of Hot Spring County, Malvern)
		x	x	Both legislators and educators need more exposure to the educational role of libraries, as opposed to the view that supports the library's role as the provider of entertainment or recreational reading materials. (Arkansas River Valley Libraries for Literacy-Reading Together, Dardanelle)
California CA				The message has been presented continuously and consistently during the past 12 years. I hope the groups above all understand the potential of libraries as educational/literacy service providers. They have certainly been told often enough! (Literacy Program, Napa City County Library, Napa)
	x	x	x	N.R. (Adult Literacy Program, Alameda County Library, Fremont)
	x	x	x	N.R. (Partners in Reading, San Jose Public Library, San Jose)
		x		N.R. (Commerce Public Library Adult Literacy Program, Commerce)
	x	x		N.R. (LVA Marin County, San Rafael Public Library, San Rafael)
Colorado CO	x	x	x	N.R. (Literacy Program, Mesa County Public Library District, Grand Junction)
Connecticut CT	x	x		N.R. (LVA-Greater Waterbury, Waterbury)
Delaware DE	x	x		N.R. (Project Reads, Sussex County Literacy Council, Georgetown)
	x	x		N.R. (LVA Wilmington Library, Wilmington)

Florida FL	x	x	x	N.R. (Project LEAD, Miami-Dade Public Library System, Miami)
		x	x	N.R. (Hillsborough Literacy Council, Tampa-Hillsborough County Library System, Tampa)
		x		N.R. (Panhandle Library Literacy Consortium, Jefferson County Public Library, Monticello)
	x	x		N.R. (Literacy Program, Brevard County Library, Cocoa)
	x	x	x	I think library directors, boards, friends, and administrators have to believe it first before we can convince anyone else. They don't tend to come to workshops on it. But we have some that do get through to them, if they attend. (Each One, Teach One, Broward County Public Library, Ft. Lauderdale)
		x	x	Generally, these two groups see the current role, but not the potential role of libraries as literacy providers. I feel that one has to have worked in the literacy field, or had a consciousness-raising experience, to appreciate the impact libraries can have on the provision of basic education to the community. The best way I know to raise the awareness is to meet and talk to functionally illiterate adults, especially those who have been in a library-sponsored literacy program. (Center for Adult Learning, Jacksonville Public Libraries, Jacksonville)
Georgia GA	x	x	x	Librarians need to be educated about the role they can play as tutors, as literacy promoters, material developers, and the ways their buildings can be used as literacy sites. [Re legislative/funding entities] increased lobbying efforts. Let them know at every opportunity the important role libraries are playing in the literacy field. [Re literacy and education professionals] I think they are fully aware of what we are doing, just choosing to ignore it. (Learning Center, Athens-Clarke County Public Library, Athens)
		x	x	N.R. (Sara Hightower Regional Library, Rome)
	x	x	x	N.R. (DeKalb County Public Library, Decatur)
Illinois IL		x		N.R. (LVA Elgin, Gail Borden Public Library, Elgin)
	x	x		N.R. (Family Literacy Partnership, Bensenville Library, Bensenville)
	x	x	x	N.R. (Libraries for Literacy in Lake County, Waukegan Public Library, Waukegan)

Indiana IN	x	x	x	It seems many people have the impression that library literacy programs are not on as professional a level as other departments of the library. This may be due to the fact that library literacy programs are associated in the public's mind with volunteer efforts and it is assumed that persons who run such programs are not professionally trained. Many library literacy programs have been staffed by volunteers or librarians who are not professionally trained in the field of education. If administrators of library literacy programs had a degree and experience in adult education, reading, or education, comparable to a librarian's degree, other professionals might take them more seriously. (Literacy Program, Michigan City Public Library, Michigan City)
		x	x	General information given to all legislators about the work libraries do in educating would really help. Reports, press releases, letters, etc. help, but don't completely inform them. The more publicity and sharing of ideas, the better. Information from the state and national departments of education to educators, literacy professionals, and legislators would help. Sharing through conferences and newsletters is good, but something more innovative would be even better. I don't have any [innovative] ideas at the moment. (Literacy Program, Anderson Public Library-Anderson)
		x		N.R. (Knox County Literacy Program, Vincennes)
Kansas KS		x		N.R. (Literacy Program, Johnson County Library, Shawnee Mission)
Massachusetts MA	x	x	x	All of these groups have some individuals who understand the issue very well but general understanding of the potential role of libraries in education and literacy education in general is still less than 100%. (Read Write/Now Program, Springfield City Library-Mason Square Branch, Springfield)
	x			Many local librarians say "This is a library, not a social service agency." I hope this attitude can be changed. (Literacy Program, Jones Library, Amherst)
		x	x	N.R. (Newcomer Family Literacy Project, The Lawrence Public Library)
		x	x	Territorial issues of "professional" educators vs. community-based teachers must be eliminated. (Literacy Program, Thomas Crane Public Library, Quincy)
Maryland MD	x	x		N.R. (Project Literacy, Howard County Library, Columbia)

Michigan MI	x	x	x	The money is not in library budget. It could be with a different attitude and role (literacy) acceptance at the state and federal levels and in the library associations such as ALA and state organizations. Suggest having these groups seriously partnership with the national literacy organizations--LVA, Laubach, National Literacy Institute--and work out a plan or formula for staffing costs at local libraries. (MARC Literacy Program, Greenville Public Library, Greenville)
Minnesota MN		x		N.R. (Linking Libraries & Literacy for Lifelong Learning, Lexington Branch Library, St. Paul)
	x		x	Many librarians immediately understand building leadership through school visits and summer reading programs. Sometimes this understanding does not extend to adults, immigrants. Also, funders and general public often regard libraries as book repositories rather than organic knowledge and community centers. (Franklin Learning Center, Franklin Community Library, Minneapolis Public Library, Minneapolis)
North Carolina NC	x	x	x	A high profile statewide campaign, such as Library Card Sign Up for Adult Literacy Students, needs to be launched in order to raise awareness of librarians and literacy providers and funders. (Community of Readers, Glenwood Library, Greensboro)
Nebraska NE	x	x		N.R. (Platte Valley Literacy Association, Columbus Public Library, Columbus)
New Jersey NJ	x	x		N.R. (Literacy for Non-English Speakers, Paterson Free Public Library, Paterson)
New Mexico NM		x		Need more contact with national literacy programs. (LVA-Socorro County, Socorro Public Library, Socorro)
New York NY	x	x	x	N.R. (Library Literacy Center of Prendergast Library, Jamestown)
	x		x	N.R. (Literacy Program, Brooklyn Public Library, NYC)
	x	x	x	(1) The libraries in the state need to enhance their public relations efforts to promote library literacy services. There could be an alliance of representatives from state library literacy programs that would serve as a forum to set policy, design programs, develop comprehensive initiatives, and share resources and information. (2) Legislatures need to be better informed about the range of library literacy services provided to constituents in their communities and the impact of those services. (3) Literacy and education professionals,

New York NY (cont'd)				until quite recently, viewed library literacy services as secondary to those offered by traditional educational institutions such as the Board of Education, BOCES, and the City University of New York. (Centers for Reading and Writing, New York Public Library)
Oklahoma OK		x		Need greater visibility of library literacy programs. While often strong locally, the impact is not felt statewide. Perhaps direct mail providing informational features on state literacy programs would be helpful. (Great Plains Literacy Council, Southern Prairie Library System, Altus)
	x	x	x	N.R. (Moore Literacy Council, Cleveland County Library, Moore)
	x	x	x	N.R. (Literacy Council of LeFlore County, Buckley Public Library, Poteau)
Oregon OR	x	x	x	[More of the following, which is] all being done to some extent in Oregon: Library newsletter articles, workshops for librarians, provision of "starter collections" of materials. Encouraging individual libraries to link with their local literacy providers by having someone travel the state to facilitate. Providing Literacy Hotline at state level. (LEARN Project, Eugene Public Library, Eugene)
Pennsylvania PA	x	x	x	(1) Librarians could receive grant money with strict guidelines to insure that adult literacy would be the focus, e.g. a family literacy project would need to include an adult instructional component as well as a children's instructional component. Staff would need training on the needs of adults with low literacy skills. (2) Literacy professionals need to be reminded that libraries exist as learning resources--tie their funding into this. Withhold funds unless cooperative activities are carried out. (Reader Development Program, Free Library of Philadelphia)
	x	x		Since librarians have to worry about funding for essential library services, it is difficult for them to take on new services or expand current literacy services. If there could be increased funding for literacy per se, then perhaps they would be more inclined to become involved. As it is now, librarians are expected to do more and more with less and less. (Bradford-Wyoming County Literacy Program, Bradford County Library, Troy)
Rhode Island RI		x	x	N.R. (LVA Kent County, Coventry Public Library, Coventry)

Texas TX		x	x	N.R. (Literacy Center, El Paso Public Library)
		x		N.R. (Proyecto Adelante, Weslaco Public Library, Weslaco)
		x		N.R. (Literacy Programs, Harris County Public Library, Houston)
		x	x	N.R. (Adult Literacy Program of Andrews Public Library, Andrews)
	x	x	x	Visit quality local programs. Read newspapers. Talk with adults who have received help from literacy programs about how this has changed their lives--social, economic, political, and educational impact. (LVA Sterling Municipal Library, Baytown)
Utah UT	x	x	x	N.R. (Bridgerland Literacy, Logan Library, Logan)
Virginia VA		x		N.R. (Literacy Program, Newport News Public Library, Newport News)
Washington WA		x	x	N.R. (Project READ, Longview Public Library, Longview)
			x	N.R. (Literacy Program/Lifelong Learning, Seattle Public Library, Seattle)
Wisconsin WI	x	x	x	Libraries are not aware of how the adult with poor skills reacts to libraries. Their structure (the libraries') makes it difficult for the adult learner. (LVAChippewa Valley/Eau Claire, L.E. Phillips Memorial Library, Eau Claire)
West Virginia WV	x	x	x	[Actually,] some [librarians understand] very well and are leaders in the field and some not well enough. (Literacy Program, Monroe County and Peterstown Public Libraries, Union)

What do you personally see as the economic and social value(s) of library literacy programs?

R7 (1)
State Librarians

Alabama AL	The mission of today's public libraries is for life-long learning, not that as the primary education/teaching source. Adult literacy programs are critical to the economic growth and stability of America. The statistics alone are overwhelming that people who cannot read cannot contribute to the economic and social infrastructure. Literacy will not solve every problem but its effect will be felt by less dollars spent on corrections, welfare, more participation in educational and political programs.
Arkansas AR	Economics: Resource materials readily available. Flexible hours of operation. Social values: Library setting is generally considered non-threatening to non-readers enrolled in literacy classes. Some new readers become life-long library users and break the cycle of intergenerational illiteracy.
DC	Provide equitable access to information to a segment of the population that didn't benefit adequately from the educational process. Literacy can be defined as using printed and written information to function in today's society, achieve one's goals, and develop one's knowledge and potential.
Delaware DE	N.R.
Florida FL	N.R.
Georgia GA	There is great value and need for literacy programs. Frankly, I do not care if they are library-based. I only care that if appropriate, each community develop a program. Hopefully the library would choose to be involved or to host the program.
Hawaii HI	Educated, motivated workforce will mean economic strength and viability to our state and community. The public library is the best positioned public agency to coordinate and lead these programs.
Iowa IA	Library literacy programs can have significant economic and social value. In much the same way as other public library programs/services, library literacy programs influence and affect local communities. In a selfish way, library literacy programs offer public libraries the opportunity to "grow" their own users.

Idaho ID	More educated electorate better able to participate in the democratic process--and a better educated workforce more able to react to changing employment opportunities.
Illinois IL	Contribution of the library to the learning community and as a community information center...the role of the public library as a partner in community educational efforts...the position of the library in economic development locally and then also in helping people acquire skills for personal growth and accomplishment...the role of the public library in working with families.
Indiana IN	I see the library as one of the partners along with educational agencies, social agencies and nonprofits where the library is able to provide basic and supplemental materials, a place not only to become more literate but to learn to use for personal advancement and well being and an electronic connection for further development of workforce skills. The library literacy program can be a non-threatening first step toward life skills, job skills, and lifelong learning.
Kansas KS	Literacy is essential to a fully functional workforce and a fully productive national economy.
Kentucky KY	N.R.
Maryland MD	N.R.
Maine ME	An informed and educated people.
Michigan MI	Library literacy programs provide a community-centered and individualized method of assisting adults to acquire essential reading skills. Libraries offer a perfect environment for the new reader or literacy student to begin using their newly acquired skills. This training brings the student into contact with government in a positive way, and facilitates the transition to becoming an independent learner and self-supporting member of the community.
Minnesota MN	Helps build a better educated workforce. Helps expand learning opportunities available to people.
Mississippi MS	Many adult learners have experienced many failures in the traditional learning environment. The library presents a less threatening setting plus gives the adult learner and his/her children an inexpensive recreational opportunity. Library literacy programs contribute to breaking the illiteracy cycle.

Montana MT	Improved workforce quality with greater flexibility to adapt to change.
North Dakota ND	Increased productivity. Better self esteem influences future generations.
Nebraska NE	I believe library literacy programs have very significant and positive value in the community. However, I also believe each library must assess its role in providing these programs based on community needs and resources.
New Hampshire NH	Library literacy programs can help adults develop literacy skills that improve their opportunities to earn more and contribute to public discourse on public policy issues, etc. Library programs can also improve a child's likelihood of becoming literate by teaching adults the value of books and reading in the home.
New Jersey NJ	Illiteracy spells unemployment, and crime.
New Mexico NM	N.R.
Nevada NV	N.R.
Ohio OH	A literate workforce has the skills to train and retrain itself in order to become a part of the economic future of our society. A literate person will be able to become a viable resource thereby adding to the economic and social value of our society.
Oregon OR	I marked "no" [to the question asking whether the provision of literacy services should be a major mission of public libraries] because I think it varies for different communities. In Oregon there are many providers, so the role of the public library varies. Of course all these programs have great economic and social value.
Pennsylvania PA	Public library participation in collaborative efforts can support the development of "community learning" and ultimately result in economic and social well-being for the residents.
Rhode Island RI	Economic: Help to make people more employable. Social: Library is a place where people needing literacy training can feel comfortable and not "put down" or out of place as is possible in schools.

South Dakota SD	The social value would be in the area of including another segment of the population in the planning of Library Programs. The segment being the "new reader". In the area of economics the library would serve more patrons and circulation would increase. In budget justifications members can equal dollars. A more literate population also equals more and/or better jobs that equal more revenue for local business and a larger tax base.
Tennessee TN	The better educated and informed an individual, the better decisions can be made leading to greater overall values in society.
Texas TX	Adult illiteracy is a serious social problem. Libraries can play a significant role in addressing this problem, and it is appropriate they do so as a part of their educational mission. The social and economic values of improved adult literacy rates are numerous and obvious.
Utah UT	Strengthening the general social fabric of our communities and nation.
West Virginia WV	As pertains to out-of-school adult illiteracy the library is the major player on the field of learning. Economic empowerment comes from opportunity to make informed, intelligent choice. Democratization and information levels out social inequities.
Wisconsin WI	Unless we have a literate population, forget democracy. Libraries are one of the foundations of democracy.

What do you personally see as the economic and social value(s) of library literacy programs?

R7 (2)

State Library Literacy Contacts

Alaska AK	Many people, especially nonreaders, are unaware of the resources available at a library that potentially can enhance the economic and personal lives of anyone looking for information. Learning to read in a library puts that wealth of possibilities before a reader's own eyes. Perhaps learning to read in a library lessens the intimidation of using a library.
Arkansas AR	Economics: Resource materials readily available, flexible hours of operation. Social: Library setting is generally considered nonthreatening to nonreaders enrolled in literacy classes. Some new readers become lifelong users and break the cycle of intergenerational illiteracy.
California CA	Extremely valuable.
Colorado CO	Since libraries have access to information streams, they can be of great use to adult learners. Libraries can provide valuable support services to adult ed programs and learners.
Connecticut CT	Puts individuals back in the mainstream, restores confidence to individuals.
Delaware DE	The greatest value of libraries in regards to literacy is in the prevention of illiteracy. Libraries can model literacy and information literacy skills for pre-schoolers to prepare them for school and for lifelong learning. Adult literacy training improves the workforce and the economy and prevents recidivism in inmates.
Florida FL	Public libraries provide a place for trained volunteer tutors to meet with adult learners, a place where adults learn to read or improve their reading skills through use of a computer, a place where non-English-speaking adults study and prepare for their high school diploma or a GED equivalency, and a place where adult learners and their families pursue lifelong learning. Florida public libraries make a difference. They provide a choice of places to learn to help meet the adult learner's needs. They are often more community-oriented than the public school and are sometimes closer to the geographic area of the home or work situation where a literacy program is needed. In addition, public libraries in Florida are usually open more hours of the week than any other public institution in the state. Public libraries provide over one-third of the literacy education programs available for adults who need basic literacy or English for speakers for other languages in Florida. They are natural partners in the state's efforts to combat illiteracy.
Hawaii HI	N.R.

Iowa IA	Literacy programs open the doors of learning to thousands who have been cut off from all the advantages of being able to read.
Idaho ID	Social value: Provides access to instruction and materials that might not be available otherwise, open to anyone, no requirements. Economic: Hard to determine, but literacy is related to employability.
Illinois IL	Library literacy programs provide a sense of stability and safety in many communities whose residents are disproportionately represented in the lower literacy levels as documented by both the adult literacy in America [sic] and Illinois surveys. Libraries also provided unlimited sources of information to meet any student's needs. Library staff also are a resource to assist those adults and families lacking the skills to locate information for themselves. As tax-supported entities, public libraries provide most of these services at no charge to clients. Money for such services is often an issue with literacy patrons.
Indiana IN	Expands library services to another portion of community, increasing community links. Helps communities economically by providing training for future workers.
Kansas KS	The information age requires a literate citizenry. Library literacy programs can be safe places of learning and continuing education after literacy.
Kentucky KY	More people producing, growing the economy.
Louisiana LA	A literate citizenry is an informed citizenry; an informed citizenry is a participative citizenry. Libraries are the most available and approachable institution for all learners in lifelong pursuits of jobs, education, and participation in democracy.
Massachusetts MA	Library literacy programs highlight a key role of the library as a source for lifelong learning. They reach out to a population which has a right to library services and programs which are traditionally under-represented in the community.
Maryland MD	N.R.
Maine ME	N.R.
Michigan MI	N.R.

Minnesota MN	Literacy is the book of knowledge; work is increasingly dependent on knowledge. Literacy is the basis of lifelong personal growth; society is dependent on fully actualized individuals.
Missouri MO	Library literacy programs can help advance the literacy level of the community, which, in the long term, advances the literacy level of the state. Higher literacy can lead to economic development, higher incomes, and greater self pride. These factors can enhance the quality of life for new readers and the library community as a whole. Missouri has a number of counties with very low literacy rates. We have targeted a number of these to be served by our family literacy program, and by local adult education programs. It is our goal to encourage local libraries to become partners in the adult education efforts of their communities.
Mississippi MS	Libraries offer a different learning environment to the adult learner...possibly less threatening than the classroom setting in which many failed. By providing reading and learning opportunities beyond completion of a literacy program, libraries answer the question of "what do I do now?". The library presents an intergenerational learning opportunity. The library also provides recreational opportunities for the whole family at no cost. The library gives the adult learner a chance to encourage their children to become library users and thus break the cycle of the nonreader.
Montana MT	Improved workforce quality with greater flexibility to adapt to change.
North Dakota ND	Economic/social development for entire community.
Nebraska NE	N.R.
New Hampshire NH	N.R.
New Jersey NJ	Now, more than at any time in U.S. history, there is a need for literacy, to simply function in our society. No more are there the agricultural and low-skill jobs that didn't require much English. One program I visited is offering sessions in telephone and microwave use--think about using a VCR with limited skills, or reading a chemical drum warning.
New Mexico NM	An effective library literacy program (one which truly does raise the skill levels of participants) has real economic and social benefits. A literate workforce is generally more "efficient". Anecdotal evidence indicates social benefits of literacy programs include better health, and reduced abuse of alcohol and drugs.

New York NY	Libraries are a permanent institution in a student's community. Services are available at no cost before, during, and after a student's enrollment in a formal education program either through the library or elsewhere. A library can be used for intergenerational learning. It provides community, job, and entrepreneurship information.
Ohio OH	A literate workforce has the skills to train and retrain itself in order to become a part of the economic future of our society. A literate person will be able to become a viable resource thereby adding to the economic and social value of our society.
Oklahoma OK	Libraries are neutral, free, "customer-friendly" places where reading is promoted and reading material is readily available. As of now, libraries have been able to access LSCA funds as well as other funding sources unavailable to community-based programs. Libraries are usually open year-round during peak hours, so literacy programs can take advantage of buildings, utilities, etc.
Oregon OR	Literacy programs contribute to the growth of literate members of society...the core user group of public libraries. By implementing library literacy programs, even modest programs that focus on information and referral only, libraries are ensuring the development of library users. These users are ripe to be cultivated into active library supporters. The ideal social effects of literate members of society would be high-self-esteem citizens who actively participate in the democratic process, raise families in a healthy environment that supports learning, and give back to the community. The ideal economic effects of literate members of society would be employed or self-employed citizens who "more than survive" financially, and willingly contribute to the "public good" through taxes, donations, etc.
Pennsylvania PA	N.R.
South Carolina SC	Connecting learning of literacy skills with place where materials are available for current and future use.
South Dakota SD	The social value would be in the area of including another segment of the population, the new reader, in the planning of library programs. In the area of economics the library would serve more patrons and circulation would increase. In budget justifications, members can equal dollars. A more literate population also equals more and/or better jobs that equal more revenue for local business and a larger tax base.
Tennessee TN	It is economically sound for any community to be better educated and more socially aware. Things just can't help being more beneficial in every area.

Texas TX	Getting children and adults interested in reading. Breaking the cycle of illiteracy. Provide the reading skills to enable individuals and their families to improve their jobs, access to information, to become knowledgeable citizens, to register as citizens, to vote, to build talents. Basically, by providing literacy programs and centers, the library is helping develop a better educated community and workforce in an accessible and non-threatening environment.
Vermont VT	To create lifelong learners, thinkers, and seekers of information for self-enlightenment; to create families that instill a lifetime of love of reading for pleasure and knowledge. To create communities that encourage learning and self growth.
Virginia VA	N.R.
Washington WA	Libraries can reach a broader range of people. Library literacy programs not only help people with literacy skills, but open a wider world of information and support. Qualifications are not as strict in library programs, nor are the waiting lists.
West Virginia WV	Libraries are a natural setting for literacy programs of all ages. The public library is a place where the reading public can be seen. What better place for a nonreader to come and feel comfortable than a place designated as a reading haven. If a person is seen entering the library it is assumed they are going in to read; secrets are safe. Many of our participants will enter the library and not the school. They have already failed, or been failed, by the school system. Also the public library is not subject to a school calendar year, school closings for staff training, evening and weekend closings.
Wisconsin WI	Unless we have a literate population, forget democracy. Libraries are one of the foundations of democracy.
Wyoming WY	Skills for survival in modern life.

What do you personally see as the economic and social value(s) of library literacy programs?

R7 (4)
Local Programs

Alabama AL

Some library literacy programs are the only ones in the area (like ours is!). These programs should work closely with Adult Basic Education to expand services and cooperation within the local area. (LVA Anniston Calhoun County)

Arkansas AR

Bringing new readers into the world of library users and providing insight into number of ways public library can help them socially and economically. Socio-economic change is to be expected with any individual enrolled and advancing in a literacy council. Through library literacy programs, this learner can see that the world is at your fingertips in the library. As a literacy provider, our goal is to help people grow and help themselves. This is a shared philosophy. (Literacy Council of Hot Spring County)

Assists learners in becoming part of the workforce by developing reading skills. Enable learners to more actively participate in community activities, school projects, etc. Enable learners to become more informed citizens and consumers. (Arkansas River Valley Libraries for Literacy - Reading Together)

California CA

Library literacy programs provide meaningful volunteer opportunities for individuals who want to serve their community by tutoring other adults. The programs enable adult learners to make significant life changes based on educational gains and increased self-esteem. These changes include finding a job, changing jobs to find a better one, discounting dependence on welfare, becoming a U.S. citizen, and becoming an active participant in the democratic process by voting. (Napa City County Library)

Library literacy programs have a great social value for adults who have felt isolated with limited skills. Programs, especially those with small group instruction, help students to reframe their perception of themselves as "failures of school" and realize systemic problems contribute to their limited literacy skills. As learners move from isolation they make a valuable contribution to their community: speaking in public schools, tutoring children (their own and others), getting involved in civic affairs including voting and citizenship. Ten of our students are currently enrolled in a leadership class to learn how to make change in their community. (Alameda County Library Adult Literacy Program)

As participants in library literacy programs improve their literacy skills, their self-esteem often improves as well. Many improve their job and parenting skills. They become more active participants in the life of their communities. They are better informed citizens and may vote for the first time. Many receive job promotions or become employed. (Partners in Reading/San Jose Public Library)

Library literacy programs help to reach a portion of the community that would otherwise not be reached. Increased literacy skills help adults increase their economic growth and can change their lives in relation to social problems--getting off welfare, helping their children more, better access to health information, etc. (Commerce Public Library Adult Literacy Program)

Social: Provides an unbiased ground for literacy education.
Economic: Libraries are an inexpensive resource for books as learning tools.
(LVA Marin County)

Colorado CO	Hard to estimate! People getting off welfare through advanced literacy skills, families breaking the cycle of illiteracy, job advancement, self-esteem, recreational reading, even. Where does literacy not affect our lives? (Mesa County Public Library District Adult Reading Program)
Connecticut CT	Outreach to groups we may not be reaching. (LVA-Greater Waterbury)
Delaware DE	Project READS is the only program in Sussex County that works with adults whose reading skills are below 4th grade level. Project READS works with the adult basic education programs in the county to insure the students get the extra individual help they need. (Project READS, Sussex County Literacy Council) Location of library in local community. Free services (books) available to community. Variety of services (reference, information, audio-visual). (LVA Wilmington Library)
Florida FL	Socially, libraries are comfortable places to learn, and librarians are seldom judgmental. Economically, with a corp of volunteers, 200-300 adults per year can be taught during the course of a year...good value for having only two library personnel in our department. (Project LEAD, Miami-Dade Public Library System) Education is the key to success. Reading is the skill required to access information in a library. All citizens should have the opportunity to access library information. (Hillsborough Literacy Council, Tampa-Hillsborough County Library System) The outreach of literacy helps [people] become better readers. Some get their GED. Others learn enough to get into the workforce and off welfare. I think all of those on welfare are nonreaders or poor readers. Literacy programs help them get jobs. (Panhandle Library Literacy Consortium, Jefferson County Public Library) I do not feel that the social and economic value of a library based literacy program can be easily measured. It is very difficult to measure success in terms of students' improved self-image and ability to better their economic prospects. Perhaps a follow-up study could be done to determine the long-term success of this kind of program. (Literacy Program, Brevard County Library) As a tool for families to reach their own goals, the social impact includes empowerment, family supplementation and support system, production of reading, learning, workforce, and living skills on a neighborhood by neighborhood basis. Increasing access to libraries, government departments and documents, and all written opportunities and tools. (Each One, Teach One, Broward County Public Library) Social values: Better readers make more informed citizens. Readers raise children who are readers. Economic values: Improved reading skills can raise the employability level of program participants. A higher level of employment in the community increases the tax base which hopefully will mean that ultimately the library will benefit by increases in budget. (Center for Adult Learning, Jacksonville Public Libraries)

Georgia GA

N.R. (Sara Hightower Regional Library)

Promotion of employability and economic self-sufficiency...citizen participation in government and community life...crime prevention...family literacy, effective parenting...enhanced quality of life (personal fulfillment, self-confidence, self-sufficiency)...improved health and safety...lifelong learners who know how to utilize the wealth of resources and services of the library. (Literacy Program, DeKalb County Public Library)

Library literacy programs have no hidden agendas. Our goal is to give the underserved, the undereducated a second opportunity to improve both their social and economic lives. Unlike some programs who are numbers driven, we are reaching out because we recognize the importance of competing in society and the tools (reading, good job skills) necessary to do so. The ultimate goal of these kinds of programs--after all libraries are about promoting lifelong learners--is to break the cycle of illiteracy by reaching out to adults and teaching them not only how learning to read will help them in their everyday lives but will also benefit their children. (Learning Center, Athens-Clarke County Public Library)

Illinois IL

They improve the quality of life and the economic stability of the community. (LVA-Elgin, Gail Borden Public Library)

N.R. (Family Literacy Partnership, Bensenville Library)

N.R. (Libraries for Literacy in Lake County)

Indiana IN

They help raise persons' skill levels so that they are more employable and better able to get off welfare rolls. Adult students come to see themselves as more capable, less dependent on others, and able to become contributing members of society. Adults who acquire literacy skills can influence their children to do better in school; there is an intergenerational pay-off. Also, self-esteem of both children and adults is increased as their learning increases. (Literacy Program, Michigan City Public Library)

The programs help people in ways that simple education through the schools cannot. We have the luxury of dealing with individual needs on individual time schedules. Schools have more difficulty doing that. In our case, we're easily accessible so that the more economically disadvantaged can arrive by bus or walk to the library. We don't charge students for our services. We can help them with learning what they may need to know for filling out applications, etc. (Literacy Program, Anderson Public Library)

Social: Literacy proficiencies are inherited to a degree, parent to child. NALS found that an individual's literacy proficiencies directly correlated to the education levels of the parents. Literate adults are more likely to be actively engaged in electoral politics of their community, state, and nation than less literate people. Economic: Adults with low literacy skills are 10 times more likely to live in poverty, 4-5 times more likely to receive food stamps, and earn one-third less money, as their counterparts with high literacy skills. Adults without (or with low) literacy skills work about one-half the hours as those with high literacy skills, and are one-third as likely to actually have interest income from savings.
(Knox County Literacy Program)

Kansas KS

Libraries need new readers, educational institutions need to prepare new learners for the challenges of today's world and democracies need an educated populace to carry on our form of government.
(Project Finish, Johnson County Library)

Massachusetts MA

Library literacy programs offer adults a second or sometimes a first chance to attain their goals for literacy. Their goals range from getting a driver's license, helping children with schoolwork, getting a job, to just increasing their independence and sense of worth. All of those goals add to the community's strength and have social and economic value. (Read Write/Now Program, Springfield City Library, Mason Square Branch)

For immigrants: The well-being of newcomers in the community hinges on their ability to enter into the economic life of the community and the services it offers. By opening up opportunities for ABE-ESL training and interaction with the public we can enable immigrants to become full participants in the community.
(Center for New Americans, Jones Library)

As centers with a wide array of informational and educational resources, the library is a natural meeting place for parents and their children. It can not only provide resources at no cost to individuals; it can also service teachers in other programs. With a well-conceived and well-implemented outreach program, the library can do a great deal to strengthen a community, especially with regard to newcomers who may be unfamiliar with the concept of a free lending library. Regarding economics, I would say that a well-run literacy program is always cost-effective. (Newcomer Family Literacy Project, Lawrence Public Library)

Library literacy programs reach the most isolated adult nonreaders who have few, if any, other hopes except the literacy program. For ESL students and families, the programs provide cultural education as well as literacy skills. Literacy programs focus on life skills, parenting, job hunting, etc. and provide assistance to people with no other assistance available. (Literacy Program, Thomas Crane Public Library)

Maryland MD

More readers--more borrowers. Less drain on Social Security system if people are literate, educated, and prepared for the work force. Positive experience for the new emerging reader dealing with an institution. (Project Literacy, Howard County Library)

Michigan MI

Social values: Libraries are easily accessible by the public and easily located. Age of patron or formal education is not a barrier. There is a degree of anonymity for patrons of libraries making it less embarrassing for adults to seek help. The library atmosphere and use of materials open up a new world for the new learner. Economic: Libraries can house literacy programs at zero or low-cost overhead expense of rent, utilities, etc. Library staff can handle inquiries as part of their regular routine and direct patron to the right person. (MARC Literacy Program, Greenville Public Library)

Minnesota MN	Informed readers are citizens who can fully participate in their government and make informed decisions about all the activities of daily living. Libraries depend on and operate for literate users who can take full advantage of all the information services and recreational reading, job and career information, education information and consumer information readily available at the public library. (Linking Libraries and Literacy for Lifelong Learning, Lexington Branch Library) Open entry, easy exit, flexible scheduling that recognizes adults have varied schedules, needs, learning styles. (Franklin Learning Center, Franklin Community Library)
North Carolina NC	N.R. (Community of Readers, Glenwood Library)
Nebraska NE	A literate employee will be a more valuable employee who will stay in the community longer and make a long-term commitment such as buying a house and sending children to school. A better educated employee should be an asset to his employer and the community he lives in. (Platte Valley Literacy Association, Columbus Public Library)
New Jersey NJ	Social values: The literacy program has a tutor support group, student support group, literacy program get-togethers, books on cultures, information on cultural sensitivity. Economic values: When learners improve their basic skills, their chances for employment or a better job improve. (Basic Skills for Reading & ESL, Elizabeth Public Library) Increased numbers of users of libraries demonstrate to city officials the importance of libraries in the lives of city residents. For children involved in family literacy programs, you will have more interested kids wanting to learn, explore, and develop their interests. (Literacy for Non-English Speakers, Paterson Free Public Library)
New Mexico NM	Free to clients and accessible and convenient. (LVA-Socorro County, Socorro Public Library)
New York NY	One special value to a library literacy program such as ours is that for the student this is often the first time in his life that any one person has ever shown an interest in the student as another human being. Our tutor-student matches are one-on one and strong friendships often develop. With some one person championing his cause, the student may become more motivated to master his reading skills. On an economic note, a program that uses volunteer tutors has got to be a lot cheaper per capita than some of the wasteful practices in the education establishment. (Literacy Center of Prendergast Library) Library is free of state education mandates. (Literacy Program, Brooklyn Public Library) Library literacy programs often serve adults who are at the most beginning levels in their reading and writing development, and who would otherwise not be eligible to participate in traditional reading and writing programs that serve populations reading above 4.0. At the New York Public Library, the literacy program serves people in communities identified as being most in need based upon current

New York NY (cont'd)

economic and educational profiles. In addition, libraries are often volunteer programs enabling community residents to give something positive back to their neighborhoods. (Centers for Reading and Writing, New York Public Library)

Oklahoma OK

They offer an avenue of service to the lay person who wishes to contribute to society and prefers to work in the one-on-one setting; demonstrate to low readers that someone cares! Extremely cost-effective in this day of shrinking funding. Volunteer tutors can't be beat. (Great Plains Literacy Council, Southern Prairie Library System)

A well run library literacy program can contribute a great deal to the social and economic values of any community. Adults who learn to read have the potential to become productive, taxpaying citizens. (Moore Literacy Council, Cleveland County Library)

Economically, literacy programs provide the means for many students to get jobs and/or to receive promotions in already existing jobs. They also help to "break the cycle of illiteracy" by providing parents the means to help their children in school, and to understand the importance of reading and literacy in improving lifestyles or "quality of life." Literate people are those most involved in their communities, in politics, in the decision making processes of local, state and national government. A well-informed citizenry is necessary to a strong country. We have also found that many of our students are not only unable to read, but are socially or culturally illiterate. Becoming literate improves people in all these areas. (Literacy Council of LeFlore County, Buckley Public Library)

Oregon OR

As adults improve their reading, writing and math skills, they earn higher wages which results in more taxes to support libraries. Also adults who are tutored in libraries or who are shown how to use library services become enthusiastic supporters. Another observed benefit is the modification of negative attitudes toward other people. (LEARN Project, Eugene Public Library)

Pennsylvania PA

Libraries are community resources. Students in adult literacy programs have an opportunity to practice understanding and respect for common property. By borrowing and returning library materials so others can use them, adult learners participate in a larger effort to build community solidarity and a sense of responsibility, not just to oneself or one's family, but to the larger neighborhood. If library literacy programs can perform a coordinating function, there is the potential for reducing duplication of services. As a result, literacy funds could be used to serve more students instead of supporting administrative functions. Since income seems to be related to educational attainment, it would follow that when literacy programs help students achieve their educational goals, the community would benefit economically. (Reader Development Program, Free Library of Philadelphia)

Libraries generally provide a non-threatening atmosphere for adult literacy students. Libraries provide instant and immediate credibility for library literacy programs. Housing literacy programs in libraries (provided precious space is available) can be cost-effecive . Sharing of resources. (Bradford-Wyoming County Literacy Program, Bradford County Library)

Rhode Island RI	Social and economic values of library literacy programs include a better informed and educated adult population more prepared to take on the important tasks of voting, finding work, understanding health-related issues, becoming discriminating shoppers, and relying less on social service agencies and individuals to determine how they will live their lives. (LVA Kent County Inc., Coventry Public Library)
South Carolina SC	Since I live in a state with high illiteracy rates and we also have inadequate schools, high rates of traffic accidents (you don't have to be able to read to get a license here), signs in the grocery store that are virtually illegible, rising rates of AIDS, and a low standard of living, I think that illiteracy contributes greatly to a fearful, conservative, and often ignorant populace. Library programs that promote literacy work to reduce all of that, and to give people the idea that information is available to help solve problems--available to everybody! (Literacy Program, Greenville County Library)
Texas TX	As evidenced by the El Paso Public Libraries Literacy Program, the social and economic value cannot be measured in quantitative terms. We have seen a transformation in our adult literacy students from insecure individuals to leaders in their community. Our programs have empowered people to become active participants in society. The economic value of a literate society is a given, people with strong educational backgrounds earn more and therefore contribute more to the economy. (Literacy Center, El Paso Public Library) Encourage and teach people to read and they will do better economically and that will benefit the community. (Proyecto Adelante, Weslaco Public Library) Libraries are centers for information and referral in many communities. They also are a place where resources are provided free, so that everyone in the community can benefit. Because of this and because libraries have books, libraries come to mind for some people when they want to find literacy help for themselves or someone they know. (Library Literacy Programs, Harris County Public Library) Introduce adults to community events. Provide information/pleasure reading activities. Provide access to vocational training opportunities, skills development, job placement and advancement. Encourage adults to become active participants in community activities--volunteer, seek citizenship, register to vote, bring children to story time at the library, etc. (LVA Sterling Municipal Library) N.R. (Adult Literacy Program of Andrews Public Library)
Utah UT	Our students become better employees, better parents, more confident, and can participate in society. They can also use the library. (Bridgerland Literacy, Logan Library)
Virginia VA	Adult students are given an opportunity to socialize with their peers, as well as interact with outside agencies such as an employment agency or self-help groups to build self-esteem. The adult student skills are strengthened to make them more marketable for prospective jobs. (Literacy Program, Newport News Public Library)

Washington WA	Library literacy programs can raise community awareness and build community support for literacy efforts. Libraries tend to be non-threatening environments--more likely to encourage learners to identify themselves. Nonreaders are an economic problem. They have difficulty finding and keeping work. (Project READ, Longview Public Library) Social values abound. It is an extension of the reading spectrum and the democratic principles which libraries hold dear. It gives the library a fuller and altruistic component to its mission. (Literacy Program/Lifelong Learning, Seattle Public Library)
West Virginia WV	Social: Teach people skills so that they can become informed to make good community decisions. Facilitate integration in community of highly literate and functionally illiterate people. Educate people so that they have skills to improve their communities and families. Economic: Positive correlation between literacy and wages and economic development. Educate people so they can get jobs or better jobs and not need public assistance. (Literacy Program, Monroe County and Peterstown Public Libraries)
Wisconsin WI	N.R. (LVA-Chippewa Valley/Eau Claire)

What benefits do libraries themselves get from providing library literacy programs (e.g. increased patronage, higher circulation figures, greater community visibility/support, cultivation of adult readers as new clientele)?

R8 (1)

State Librarians

Alabama AL	I believe the greatest benefit to our public libraries is in increased community visibility as the life-long learning institution in the community. Little direct increased funding results from being the literacy center.
Arkansas AR	All of the above on a limited basis.
DC	Improved literacy skills development of adults leads to greater library usage, increased circulation, and more family literacy activities, which leads to intergenerational library use.
Delaware DE	Expanding the type of community services (and visibility) the library offers.
Florida FL	All of the above!
Georgia GA	All of the above.
Hawaii HI	Community recognition for doing worthwhile mission. Increased user and circulation count.
Iowa IA	Certainly all of benefits named. The greatest benefit being greater community visibility/support.
Idaho ID	I would agree with all of the above, as well as a sense of bettering the overall community and individual satisfaction from successful example.
Illinois IL	Visibility, stronger self assessment of role of libraries today, political visibility too.

Indiana IN	The above items re direct benefits but as libraries' mission is the education, entertainment, and development of citizens, the real benefit is in a more informed citizenry and better communities.
Kansas KS	Your points above are good ones. Library's support of workforce literacy makes the library a contributor in this additional way to the local, state, and national economy.
Kentucky KY	New patrons. Increased number of supporters. Public relations. Increased awareness of the library as a vital community resource.
Maryland MD	N.R.
Maine ME	All of the above plus collaboration with other community groups which could grow into other projects/programs.
Michigan MI	Libraries benefit by expanding the number of literate adults in the community, and by being seen as an active supporter of self-improvement. The community perception of the public library as a "public good" can result in wider support for library funding, both by millage or by appropriation.
Minnesota MN	A way to serve another segment of the population. Introduces people to public library service. Visibility as an education agency in the community.
Mississippi MS	Increase exposure of the library as a valuable community service. Create a wider base of patrons to serve. Increase circulation of adult as well as juvenile materials.
Montana MT	New readers and supporters. Greater understanding among the reading public that there are those citizens out there who cannot read.
North Dakota ND	Greater support.

Nebraska NE	I believe those involved with literacy programs see their benefit in helping people improve their skills and potential. An effect is that these individuals become customers and advocates.
New Hampshire NH	Besides those cited above, literacy programs can serve as a catalyst for community and regional cooperative activities.
New Jersey NJ	An expanded constituency.
New Mexico NM	N.R.
Nevada NV	N.R.
Ohio OH	All of the stated examples would be benefits to a library providing literacy training. Depending upon the library's involvement, the benefit would vary. Most important would be the possible usage for lifelong learning of the new reader.
Oregon OR	I think these programs have great p.r. value for libraries and help them build support in other areas.
Pennsylvania PA	Some increased community visibility. Cultivation of adult new readers as a new clientele.
Rhode Island RI	N.R.
South Dakota SD	Yes, yes, yes. All of the above and more. Coordinating with other agencies pays dividends in many ways beyond literacy. New readers bring their families and friends and family literacy is a priority for them. Everyone wins.
Tennessee TN	The benefits are listed in above examples.
Texas TX	All of the above, plus contributing to the solution of a major social problem.

Utah UT	All of the above except (perhaps) higher circulation. Also improved collaboration/partnerships with other community agencies.
West Virginia WV	Without readers, why libraries? More readers--more users seems to be a reasonable formula.
Wisconsin WI	Connections with other vital community services--primarily literacy providers, but also refugee organizations, job services, etc. Greater community visibility/support. Cultivation of adult readers as new clientele.

What benefits do libraries themselves get from providing library literacy programs (e.g. increased patronage, higher circulation figures, greater community visibility/support, cultivation of adult readers as new clientele)? R8 (2)

State Library Literacy Contacts

Alaska AK	All of the above. [In cultivation of adult readers as new clientele] when adults become readers, often their children become more interested in reading, too.
Arkansas AR	All of the above on a limited basis.
California CA	Greater community visibility/support.
Colorado CO	Cultivation of new readers as clientele.
Connecticut CT	Greater community visibility/support. Cultivation of adult readers as new clientele.
Delaware DE	All of the above. By providing an indispensable service to the community and local businesses, libraries become essential.
Florida FL	All of the above. A citizen who can now make informed decisions, lobby, and vote for increases in library millages, impact fees, the need for increased funding to support capital improvement projects and other programs to enhance library services.
Hawaii HI	N.R.
Iowa IA	All of the above.
Idaho ID	Greater community visibility/support.
Illinois IL	In addition to the benefits mentioned above, libraries reach a larger percentage of the community population and their services therefore become more cost effective. Librarians also gain the opportunity to show that today's libraries are more than just books--they provide a variety of materials and services to community members which creates a more educated, knowledgeable support base. In many instances funds for literacy programs provide additional technology equipment which is used by the general library population as well. Libraries can also become greater partners with schools through family literacy activities.

Indiana IN	Increased patronage--adult readers become patrons. Community visibility. Building bridges to work with other community agencies.
Kansas KS	Better understanding of the world around them--to plan for the future.
Kentucky KY	New patrons, higher circulation.
Louisiana LA	The libraries gain new and wider identification as an involved and active agency in the community.
Massachusetts MA	Library literacy programs should be part of the mission of the library even if it is only to respond to the most basic level of providing information and referral to other programs. Primarily, other than a mission service to all, a good program does provide wonderful visibility and brings in new patrons, both learners and tutors.
Maryland MD	Increased visibility within the community.
Maine ME	N.R.
Michigan MI	N.R.
Minnesota MN	This is their purpose. It demonstrates they are doing what is worth public investment. It strengthens a base of public undertanding and public support. It enlarges the reach of library services and fulfills purpose.
Missouri MO	All of the above mentioned can be considered as long-term benefits for libraries involved in literacy programs. The most important benefit, perhaps, is that the library becomes an integral, proactive member of the education community.
Mississippi MS	By providing literacy services libraries will gain satisfaction from knowing that they are making their services available to a larger percentage of the citizens in the community. Library literacy programs have the potential of creating a whole new pool of library users by turning adult nonreaders into library users who will in turn introduce their children to the library.

Montana MT	New readers and supporters. Greater understanding among the reading public that there are those citizens out there who cannot read.
North Dakota ND	Greater community visibility/support.
Nebraska NE	N.R.
New Hampshire NH	N.R.
New Jersey NJ	More than the above benefits, which are true, is the longstanding mission of the libraries as "universities of the people," empowering those without many outer resources, but who have the courage and spunk to go for a better life for themselves and their children.
New Mexico NM	Greater community visibilityi/support. Some have indicated a perception of improved/increased relevancy.
New York NY	Libraries are chartered to serve a given area. Literacy services attract people who would never otherwise use the library. Fact that the library is serving more than "middle class" can be useful for community collaboration.
Ohio OH	All of the stated examples would be benefits. Depending upon the libraries' involvement, the benefit would vary. Most important would be the possible usage for lifelong learning of the new reader.
Oklahoma OK	Literacy activities usually are positive PR for libraries. Local literacy workshops, special events, fundraising projects, and outstanding student and tutor stories often make front page news in local papers. Hosting a literacy program is a win-win situation. Students improve their reading abilities and hopefully become library users, tutors and volunteers form another collaboration with the library, and the library provides a valuable service to the community.
Oregon OR	Libraries [that implement library literacy programs] are ensuring the development of library users. These users are ripe to be cultivated into active library supporters. Libraries offering literacy services benefit from increasing their status in the perception of partners in the adult education field, from the satisfaction of helping others, and from the extreme good will associated with newly empowered adult new readers.

Pennsylvania PA	N.R.
Rhode Island RI	Community partnerships. Better understanding of library services. Opportunity for exposure of traditional nonusers to public libraries.
South Dakota SD	Yes, yes, yes.
Tennessee TN	All of the examples cited lead to the enhancement of education, thus the community is much better off.
Texas TX	All of the above plus increased staff awareness of illiteracy and sensitivity to patrons who may not read and collaboration with other agencies and organizations in the community.
Vermont VT	Broader use of a community service that should be available to all.
Virginia VA	N.R.
Washington WA	Libraries derive a variety of benefits from providing literacy programs: increased visibility in the community as a socially-concerned institution, improved public relations, increased base of supporters, greater connection with key leaders in a community, and more customers using the library.
West Virginia WV	Literacy programs reach a section of our population that have been unserved. If we purport to reach into the communities we serve and do not address the non-reading population then we need to change our mission to state that we will serve those that can and do read. We assume that libraries should be supported by the tax base of the communities where we are located, without often considering the needs of the people in the community. Literacy programs encourage a larger cross section of our community to use the library. Support is directly related to the usage and awareness of the patrons.
Wisconsin WI	Greater community visibility/support, cultivation of adult readers as new clientele. Connections with other vital community services, primarily literacy providers, but also refugee organizations, job services, etc.
Wyoming WY	All of the above.

CONTENTS
2. Technology

T1 Do you think it is important for library literacy programs in your state to make more use of COMPUTERS? (Q1-Q4)

T2 Do you think the state public library system would benefit from adopting or making heavier use of DISTANCE LEARNING TECHNOLOGY (tv and related video technology) for adult literacy purposes? (Q1-Q4)

T3 If you think more use of computers or of distance learning technologies is important, what plans do you have for achieving this? (Q1-Q4)

T4 What are the 2-3 more significant barriers you face in bringing about more, and more effective, use of computers and distance learning technology (e.g. lack of software... lack of interest among library management, librarians, or the community...lack of hardware...network access)? (Q1-Q4)

T5 If you want to increase your use of technology, indicate any programs or specific resources currently using technology, if any, upon which you would like to model your technology program. (Q4 only)

T6 In what way would you work with the state library agency and local libraries to implement effective use of technology in library literacy programs? (Q3 only)

T6a In what way would you work with local or state groups (e.g. the state library agency, local libraries, the state literacy resource center or statewide planning body, etc.) to implement effective use of technology in your program? (Q4 only)

Do you think it is important for library literacy programs in your state to make more use of COMPUTERS?

															T1
		Q1				Q2				Q3				Q4	
	Yes	No	N.S.	No R	Yes	No	N.S.	No R	Yes	No	N.S.	No R	Yes	No	N.S.	No R
Alabama AL	1								1					1		
Alaska AK							1		1							
Arkansas AR	1				1								2			
Arizona AZ									1							
California CA					1				1				3	2		
Colorado CO					1				1				1			
Connecticut CT					1				1				1			
DC	1															
Delaware DE	1				1				1				1	1		
Florida FL	1				1				1				4		2	
Georgia GA	1				1								3			
Hawaii HI	1				1				1							
Iowa IA	1				1				1							
Idaho ID			1				1									
Illinois IL	1				1				1				2	1		
Indiana IN	1				1				1				1	2		
Kansas KS	1				1				1				1			
Kentucky KY	1				1				1							
Louisiana LA					1				1							
Massachusetts MA					1								3	1		
Maryland MD		1			1				1						1	
Maine ME	1							1								
Michigan MI			1					1	1					1		
Minnesota MN	1				1				1				2			
Missouri MO							1		1							
Mississippi MS	1				1				1							
Montana MT			1				1		1							
North Carolina NC									1				1			
North Dakota ND	1				1				1							
Nebraska NE	1							1	1						1	
New Hampshire NH	1							1		1						
New Jersey NJ	1				1				1				2			
New Mexico NM	1					1			1				1			
Nevada NV	1															
New York NY					1				1				2		1	
Ohio OH	1				1				1							
Oklahoma OK					1				1				3			
Oregon OR	1				1								1			
Pennsylvania PA	1							1	1				2			
Rhode Island RI	1												1			
South Carolina SC					1				1				1			
South Dakota SD	1				1				1							
Tennessee TN	1						1		1							
Texas TX	1				1								3	1	1	
Utah UT			1						1				1			
Vermont VT						1			1							
Virginia VA								1	1				1			
Washington WA					1				1				1	1		
West Virginia WV	1				1				1				1			
Wisconsin WI	1				1				1				1			
Wyoming WY						1										
Totals	30	1	4	0	30	3	5	6	39	1	0	0	46	11	6	0
				35				44				40				63
% Total Responds	*86*	*3*	*11*		*79*	*8*	*13*		*98*	*2*			*73*	*18*	*9*	

Do you think the state public library system would benefit from adopting or making heavier use of																T2
DISTANCE LEARNING TECHNOLOGY (tv and related video technology) for adult literacy purposes?																
		Q1				Q2				Q3				Q4		
	Yes	No	N.S.	No R	Yes	No	N.S.	No R	Yes	No	N.S.	No R	Yes	No	N.S.	No R
Alabama AL		1							1					1		
Alaska AK							1		1							
Arkansas AR	1				1								1		1	
Arizona AZ									1							
California CA						1			1				2	1	2	
Colorado CO								1	1						1	
Connecticut CT					1				1				1			
DC	1															
Delaware DE		1					1		1					1	1	
Florida FL	1				1							1	3		3	
Georgia GA	1				1								3			
Hawaii HI	1					1				1						
Iowa IA	1				1				1							
Idaho ID			1				1									
Illinois IL	1				1				1				2	1		
Indiana IN	1						1		1				1		2	
Kansas KS		1			1				1					1		
Kentucky KY	1				1				1							
Louisiana LA							1		1							
Massachusetts MA					1								1	1	2	
Maryland MD		1				1			1						1	
Maine ME	1							1								
Michigan MI		1						1	1				1			
Minnesota MN			1					1	1				1		1	
Missouri MO							1		1							
Mississippi MS	1				1				1							
Montana MT			1				1		1							
North Carolina NC									1				1			
North Dakota ND	1				1				1							
Nebraska NE	1							1	1						1	
New Hampshire NH	1							1			1					
New Jersey NJ	1						1		1				1		1	
New Mexico NM	1						1			1				1		
Nevada NV	1															
New York NY								1	1				3			
Ohio OH	1				1				1							
Oklahoma OK					1				1				1	1	1	
Oregon OR		1			1								1			
Pennsylvania PA			1					1	1				1		1	
Rhode Island RI	1														1	
South Carolina SC						1			1						1	
South Dakota SD	1				1				1							
Tennessee TN			1		1				1							
Texas TX			1		1								1	2	2	
Utah UT			1						1				1			
Vermont VT						1			1							
Virginia VA								1	1				1			
Washington WA					1					1				2		
West Virginia WV	1				1				1					1		
Wisconsin WI	1				1				1				1			
Wyoming WY					1											
Totals	22	6	7	0	21	5	9	9	35	3	1	1	28	13	22	0
				35				44				40				63
% of Total Responds	*63*	*17*	*20*		*60*	*14*	*26*		*90*	*8*	*2*		*44*	*21*	*35*	

If you think more use of computers or of distance learning technologies is important, what plans do you have for achieving this?

State Librarians

	C	DLT	
Alabama AL	x		N.R.
Arkansas AR	x	x	We have provided subgrants to public libraries from LSCA funds to purchase equipment for satellite transmitting and for Internet access. As federal funds become available, we will continue to make technology for libraries a priority. Although these subgrants were not limited to literacy, teleconferencing could be a part of cooperative community literacy programs held at the library.
DC	x	x	DCPL has established a computer-assisted literacy center for use by adult learners, tutors, and literacy practitioners, with plans underway for the lab completion at the Southwest branch library within the next fiscal year.
Delaware DE	x	x	The Electronic Library of Delaware project will deliver via the Delaware Library Information Network resources that could support literacy efforts.
Florida FL	x	x	State Librarian is a statutorily organized member of Florida Distance Learning Network Board and has made literacy a major goal in statewide needs and technology assessment.
Georgia GA	x	x	N.R.
Hawaii HI	x	x	We have four computer-assisted learning centers established, technology is being installed in February 1996 for all other public libraries.
Iowa IA	x	x	The State Library is encouraging libraries to install distance learning education meeting rooms and to make extensive use of electronic information resources available via the Internet.
Idaho ID	N.S.*	N.S.*	N.R.
Illinois IL	x	x	Our state resource center is leading the way with training. More partnerships with industry. Our libraries are well equipped but need more training in applications.
Indiana IN	x	x	Through development of satellite receive sites at public libraries and participation of public libraries in community networks. Connection to the Internet.

* Not Sure

Kansas KS	x	x	KSL provides literacy program grants which may be/have been used for technology.
Kentucky KY	x	x	N.R.
Maine ME	x	x	We have a number of bond issues in the legislature this year and hope to get more $ for funding technology in libraries.
Michigan MI	N.S.		Projects presented to the Library of Michigan Foundation for funding may include technology.
Minnesota MN	x		We have been much involved with dissemination of GED on TV series in public libraries. I always wonder, though, if many students would do better with a more personal approach and more personal support.
Mississippi MS	x	x	Mississippi is in the planning/implementation stages of establishing a statewide library telecommunications network. This network will be compatible with academic and government agency networks.
Montana MT	N.S.	N.S.	N.R.
North Dakota ND	x	x	Statewide public Internet access via public libraries demo program with literacy students being implemented now.
Nebraska NE	x	x	None at this time.
New Hampshire NH	x	x	N.R.
New Jersey NJ	x	x	This is part of Thomas Edison College's mission.
New Mexico NM	x	x	N.R.
Nevada NV	x	x	Looking for resources.
Ohio OH	x	x	We will continue to work with the Ohio Literacy Resource Center in the promotion of cooperative library/community agency ventures in order to educate the library personnel about what software is available.
Oregon OR	x		I think the Internet and World Wide Web are the most promising technologies right now. Video is too expensive. We are watching these developments.
Pennsylvania PA	x		N.R. (Yes, for libraries currently providing instruction.)

Rhode Island RI	x	x	We work with literacy providers both in libraries and elsewhere to encourage and support computer literacy among providers.
South Dakota SD	x	x	The South Dakota Literacy Resource Center, Adult Basic Education, and South Dakota Literacy Council have and will continue using the South Dakota Rural Distance Telecommunicatons Network to provide training and hold board meetings.
Tennessee TN	x	N.S.	N.R.
Texas TX	x	N.S.	Working with elementary and higher education groups to develop master plan for the state.
Utah UT	N.S.	N.S.	We are building statewide Internet connectivity for public libraries, but this is not specifically a literacy program.
West Virginia WV	x	x	Over 100 public libraries are downlink sites for distance education and we are incorporating technology with literacy mission.
Wisconsin WI	x	x	Encourage librarians to make use of computers in grant applications. Work with technical college system to explore technologies.

If you think more use of computers or of distance learning technologies is important, what plans do you have for achieving this?

	C	DLT	
Alabama AL	x		N.R.
Alaska AK	x	x	n/a
Arkansas AR	x	x	We have provided subgrants to public libraries from LSCA funds to purchase equipment for satellite transmitting and for Internet access. As federal funds become available, we will continue to make technology for libraries a priority. Although these subgrants were not limited to literacy, teleconferencing could be a part of cooperative community literacy programs held at the library. (Identical to Q1)
California CA	x		State library allows use of literacy funds for local purchase of technology in year 1, and after year 5 with state matching funds.
Colorado CO	x		N.R.
Connecticut CT	x	x	I have worked with our library school to initiate courses in local libraries for library students--has just started.
Delaware DE	x	N.S.	n/a
Florida FL	x	x	The State Librarian has been appointed to serve as a member of the Florida Distance Learning Network Board. In addition, literacy is a major goal in statewide needs and technology assessment.
Georgia GA	x	x	N.R.
Hawaii HI	x		N.R.
Iowa IA	x	x	Libraries have spent millions to purchase computers. The State Library has a $2.5 million grant to bring online information to libraries. Iowa has spent more than $100 million for distance education; 90 public libraries are on the network.
Idaho ID	N.S.	N.S.	N.R.

Illinois IL	x	x	We've already produced some interactive video conferences on literacy through ISL and intend to expand. There is an ongoing marketing issue for library involvement in these technologies. [We need to] train more educators and librarians in delivering information in this format, increase our video holdings on literacy issues in libraries with permission to duplicate for local programs, and encourage more libraries to purchase necessary technology for distance learning downlinks.
Indiana IN	x	N.S.	None
Kansas KS	x	x	N.R.
Kentucky KY	x	x	N.R.
Louisiana LA	x	N.S.	We continuously look at grant/funding opportunities for hardware and software, and disseminate information on these.
Massachusetts MA	x	x	[Yes, but essential to use distance learning models--e.g. states like PA--which can provide training.] I am currently working on a project to provide Internet access to 5 libraries (see attached abstract).
Maryland MD	x		None from the point of view of library development. Cannot answer on behalf of local jurisdictions.
Minnesota MN	x		Current efforts go into holding up technology as a tool, working to ensure over time equitable access to these tools, and encouraging library services to place technology at the use of their publics.
Missouri MO	N.S.	N.S.	Technology certainly has a place in education, but it should not be used to replace the one-on-one interaction that tutoring brings. Technology can be used as an enhancement to "regular classroom" instruction. We are involved in cooperative efforts with the state reference center in locating programs and systems that would work well in an adult basic education environment.
Mississippi MS	x	x	Mississippi is in the planning/implementation stages of establishing a statewide library telecommunications network. This network will be compatible with academic and government agency networks. (Identical to Q1)
Montana MT	N.S.	N.S.	N.R.
North Dakota ND	x	x	Developing program to introduce literacy students to computers, e-mail, the Internet via public libraries.

New Jersey NJ	x	N.S.	Our state does not currently have funding specifically for this technology, although we see computer components in almost every application for funding. It should be noted that while the technology has its uses and can be very effective at certain levels, it currently is no replacement for one-on-one or small group sessions with other speakers or tutors.
New Mexico NM		N.S.	N.R.
Nevada NV	x	x	Looking for resources.
New York NY	x		A number of the literacy grants funded purchased multi-media hardware and software.
Ohio OH	x	x	We will continue to work with the Ohio Literacy Resource Center in the promotion of cooperative library/community agency ventures in order to educate the library personnel about what software is available. (Identical to Q1)
Oklahoma OK	x	x	The Department of Libraries is placing at least one computer in each public library in our state. The Literacy Office has established an electronic bulletin board for literacy. The BB lists local, state, and national training, grant and employment opportunities, legislative alerts and literacy "swap" lists.
Oregon OR	x	x	An LSCA Title VI set up six adult learning work stations in public libraries for the purpose of demonstrating their effectiveness. Sharing the results of this demonstration should assist in increasing the use of the technology. The Oregon Information Highway Project is attempting to increase Internet connectivity in public libraries. If adult learning programs can be effectively transmitted, adult new readers could certainly use them once the libraries are connected to the Internet. Libraries also need to refer students more to programs broadcast over the state's distance learning system as administered through ABE programs in community colleges.
South Carolina SC	x		N.R.
South Dakota SD	x	x	The South Dakota Literacy Resource Center, Adult Basic Education, and South Dakota Literacy Council have and will continue using the South Dakota Rural Distance Telecommunications Network to provide training and hold board meetings. (Identical to Q1)
Tennessee TN	N.S.	x	At this point, each community stakeholder would be positively affected and we will encourage each library to plan for education to be available in alternate routes.

Texas TX	x	x	[DLT particularly for rurally isolated areas of state.] We are providing funding for public libraries to connect to the Internet. We are encouraging systems to collaborate with community agencies and organizations to share catalogs and resources online. We are providing funds for community information referral programs in the libraries through a competitive Title I grant.
Washington WA	x	x	I believe the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges is investigating increased use of distance learning. Some public libraries have received grants of federal money to develop and set up computer labs. Cooperation with literacy groups.
West Virginia WV	x	x	Technologies must be used as another format to reach non-traditional students. Technology will not be a quick, easy, cheap, answer to all our problems. We need to use technology, such as computers and distance learning, along with our existing programs as another tool. Then we may be able to expand the participation of patrons and expand the information accessible.
Wisconsin WI	x	x	N.R.
Wyoming WY		x	No funds; encouragement only.

If you think more use of computers or of distance learning technologies is important, what plans do you have for achieving this?

SLRC's

	C	DLT	
Alabama AL	x	x	Implementation of performance, measurement, reporting, and improvement systems (continuous improvement of programs).
Alaska AK	x	x	We're doing it.
Arizona AZ	x	x	NIFL grant to Western Region for electronic networking among SLRCs and national entities.
California CA	x	x	We are working closely with the Distance Learning Project of the California Department of Education.
Colorado CO	x	x	Working on a networking/communication system.
Connecticut CT	x	x	Developing more training for literacy providers in the use of new technology. Developing a software/media library for previewing and circulation. Home Page on the Internet.
Delaware DE	x	x	N.R.
Florida FL	x	N.R.	n/a
Hawaii HI	x		The Hawaii SLRC belongs to a regional hub.

Iowa IA	x	x	Center will be server site on Internet in Winter/Spring 96. Will position computers/modems at each community college ABE site and public library.
Illinois IL	x	x	We have trained 19 providers statewide in a train-the-trainer program using NCAL's AOL and Internet five day training program. We have also encouraged programs to use state and federal grant dollars for modems and communication packages as well as instructional software for students. We contracted with the Illinois Center of Excellence for Technology Development at Waubonsee Community College to do regional workshops on technology planning, integrating technology in instruction and hypermedia. We have been participants in video conferences produced by the Illinois State Library and Western Illinois University.
Indiana IN	x	x	Network through computers. Have system operators responsible for monitoring, cultivating dialogue on certain topics. Research Center to coordinate.
Kansas KS	x	x	The public tv station in Kansas City, KS has provided the opportunity to electronically link all adult ed facilities. Funds are available to add all library literacy programs to that network, but they are not approved for that use.
Kentucky KY	x	x	Literacy providers and therefore students do not have ready access to technology hardware and courseware. Steps have been taken to ensure that each literacy provider has computerized record keeping capability. Funds are not available to the adult education network to keep adult students technologically literate.
Louisiana LA	x	x	We were the first state to link the JSEP program to incarcerated youth and adults. Recidivism has dropped dramatically. LSU has initiated 6 family literacy sites--in remote areas--via full motion interactive video over telephone lines.
Maryland MD	x	x	This year's program plan includes merging with the local area network to publicize the Center's materials and activities.
Michigan MI	x	x	We conduct professional development programs via two-way interactive tv. Also, conduct business meetings. Provide training on two-way and have established a bulletin board (computer).

Minnesota MN	x	x	We're looking at developing on a state level an information network using the World Wide Web, linking information about the state-level organizations. We are planning to cultivate a network of groups around the state that can coordinate distance learning opportunities in their areas. We also want to use the Internet as a delivery mechanism.
Missouri MO	x	x	We are purchasing videos and software to loan. We are planning to develop professional development classes/ workshops for distance learning. We are going to have a Home Page on WWW.
Mississippi MS	x	x	We are developing a plan to provide training to practitioners and other interagency personnel, also to link resources.
Montana MT	x	x	None currently. But a long-range, strategic planning process is "in the works."
North Carolina NC	x	x	Contact for NCAL/PBS teleconferences. Distance learning is included in family literacy plans. Participating in Internet access project as part of NIFL technology grant for regional hubs. Software evaluation and "vendor fair" (planning stages)-- in cooperation with NCLA Literacy Committee.
North Dakota ND	x	x	No concrete plans at this time.
Nebraska NE	x	x	The SLRC is preparing to conduct a statewide survey of adult literacy providers (ABE/GED, ESL, volunteer literacy groups, community-based, library, etc.) to assess existing computer use and/or access and begin to identify what is needed across the state to encourage greater use of technology. We are hoping to establish a statewide literacy listserv available to all groups, learners, businesses, agencies, etc. We are also beginning some staff development efforts (ABE/GED only) utilizing distance education technologies. There will be additional training provided across the state beginning next summer, to help familiarize people with the use of computers in an instructional/learning capacity.

New Hampshire NH		N.S.	N.R.
New Jersey NJ	x	x	Raising awareness of positive impact appropriately used instructional technology has. Demonstration workshops and library lending of SLRC owned software and videotape. Model practices workshops using local program staff currently involved with the use of technology.
New Mexico NM	x		We have initiated a number of privately funded projects to place computers and software with local literacy programs. We plan to continue to do this.
New York NY	x	x	None at this time because the SLRC will cease to exist after 12/31/95.
Ohio OH	x	x	OLRC maintains a gopher and WWW server for adult ed resources. We provide training on the Internet for teachers. We maintain a listserv for Ohio adult literacy educators. We are the Regional Technology Hub for the eleven other Midwest SLRCS (NIFL grant). We will be helping them develop WWW pages, add state-specific information to the server, and work with local programs to use the resources on the Internet.
Oklahoma OK	x	x	More funding for equipment and training.
Pennsylvania PA	x	x	Provide resources/training in the administrative/instructional use of technology. Initially a plan was developed to create a Center for the use of distance learning technologies. However, with the recession of funding, full implementation of the "Tech Center" will be placed on hold.
South Carolina SC	x	x	We provide much training in CAI. We also use "The Coach" (see brochure) at local business and industry sites. A JTPA grant pays for the driver.

South Dakota SD	x	x	The Technology is in place and in use for online access to and borrowing of materials. The sharing of resources is a must in this time of shrinking state and federal budgets.
Tennessee TN	x	x	Limited staff development has been offered via satellite downlink. At present, there are no plans (and no funds) to develop distance learning opportunities for literacy programs.
Utah UT	x!	x	We have secured the latest technology and media (CD-Rom's, Internet connections, etc.) and we demonstrate and train adult literacy providers throughout the state in the application of these technologies. We have launched distance learning instructional programs via public television.
Vermont VT	x	x	LINC's grant -- NIFL funding. Support from Dept. of Education. Promotion of professional development opportunities, including state conferences.
Virginia VA	x	x	Our state has invested heavily in automating the SLRC and for the SLRC to establish electronic info/communications system with local programs, state programs, and on a national level. Technology implementation and training in use of said technology is a major goal for our SLRC.
Washington WA	x	x	Continue to provide training in use of technology. Continue to publish technology users' guides annually. Explore use of Internet as practitioner-inquiry group medium.
West Virginia WV	x	x	We currently have a 5-year plan underway. (If funding exists, it will be continued.) We are sequentially and geographically providing training and equipment to literacy providers across the state.
Wisconsin WI	x	x	The Wisconsin Literacy Resource Network is actively involved in bringing together technology suppliers and instructors to promote planning and professional development.
Wyoming WY		x	No funds; encouragement only.

If you think more use of computers or of distance learning technologies is important, what plans do you have for achieving this?

	C	DLT	
Alabama AL	x	x	N.R. (LVA Anniston Calhoun County)
Arkansas AR	x	N.S.	Computers are today--and so are our students! Any computer-related services offered to volunteers (training, in-service, instruction) would be realistic in today's tech. It represents reading for living/life skills, pay off of economic and social promotions for individuals. Again, space is limited. (Literacy Council of Hot Spring County)
	x	x	We are looking at ways to make the computer more available to ESL students. (Arkansas River Valley Libraries for Literacy--Reading Together)
California CA	x	x	Finding funds to support the purchase of computer(s). (Literacy Program, Napa City County Library)
	N.S.	N.S.	N.R. (Adult Literacy Program, Alameda County Library)
	x	x	We have been part of a computer-aided literacy project for the past 3 years (fiscal agent is Santa Clara County Library). We plan to continue participating as long as it is funded. (Partners in Reading/San Jose Public Library)
	x	N.S.	We use computers with our students. We would like for 90% of students to be tied into a computer group in addition to their tutoring. We are scheduling more classes. (Commerce Public Library Adult Literacy Program)
	x	x	Currently working with local community college to use download training/in-service sessions for tutors. Also working with local network expert to network all office computers and computer in off-site office for better use of management software. (LVA Marin County, San Rafael Public Library)
Colorado CO	x	N.S.	None at present. Our library is very limited in space available. We need sites for computers if we decide to expand. (Note: The video conferences we've participated in have not proven very effective for our use.) (Literacy Program, Mesa County Public Library District)
Connecticut CT	x	x	We have three computers loaded with educational software for learners and a TV/VCR. (LVA-Greater Waterbury, Silas Bronson Library)

Delaware DE		N.S.	N.R. (Project Reads: Sussex County Literacy Council Sussex County Department of Libraries)
	x		Purchase new, updated equipment and software. (LVA-Wilmington Library)
Florida FL	N.S.	N.S.	N.R. (Project LEAD, Miami-Dade Public Library System)
	x	N.S.	None--support for program is dwindling. We're focused now on simply maintaining what we have. (Hillsborough Literacy Council, Tampa-Hillsborough County Library System)
	x	x	We have educational computer programs in our literacy learning center from pre-K up on reading, math, geography, etc. Videos to teach reading at home or train tutors. (Panhandle Library Literacy Consortium, Jefferson County Public Library)
	N.S.	N.S.	N.R. (Literacy Program, Brevard County Library)
	x	x	It is going to be a focus of fund raising in the next two years. (Each One, Teach One, Broward County Public Library)
	x	x	Our most recent purchases have included CD-ROMS and sound. We use videotapes and would like to be able to purchase more videos. We have made no plans for distance learning but would like to collaborate with other local providers to begin to explore ways to offer our students this option. (Center for Adult Learning, Jacksonville Public Libraries)
Georgia GA	x	x	We are in the process of trying to add more computers to our Learning Center as well as initiate them in our outreach facilities/locations. We have extended the satellite dish capabilities to our Learning Center to facilitate distance learning. Extended network to Learning Center to facilitate computer-based education. (Learning Center, Athens-Clarke County Public Library, Athens)
	x	x	We use both and currently have a 24-hour, 7-day a week television cable channel devoted to literacy. (Literacy Program, Sara Hightower Regional Library)
	x	x	To seek grant funds for additional computer learning labs and a mobile computer learning lab. When the library becomes connected to the Internet, we'd like to provide special opportunities for adult learners to participate in listservs such as LEARNER. To develop a coalition of county agencies to address literacy needs of their employees which could be met by using a mobile computer lab and/or the library distance learning site. (Literacy Program, DeKalb County Public Library)
Illinois IL	x	x	N.R. (Family Literacy Partnership, Bensenville Library)
	x	x	Currently involved in statewide pilot project for technology. Wrote a technology plan for library literacy. (Libraries for Literacy in Lake County)

Indiana IN	N.S.	N.S.	Our program has made available learn-to-read video programs and GED instructional videos that are available for check-out in the AV department. Use of computers for literacy instruction is debatable: they offer privacy to the student, who can work without a tutor; however, most software is limited to drills that give practice after learning has taken place (they are weak on providing initial instruction). (Literacy Program, Michigan City Public Library)
	N.S.		N.R. (Literacy Program, Anderson Public Library)
	x	N.S.	We have already requested certain hardware and software as "wish lists," and include hardware purchases among those items we could use from local benefactors. Our use of technology would primarily aid us in work throughout, and not so much in our educational objectives. (Knox County Literacy Program, Knox County Public Library, Vincennes)
Kansas KS	x		We are seeking computers, software and cash donations from our business community. (Literacy Program, Johnson County Library)
Massachusetts MA		N.S.	We are using a computer grant this year to fully develop the use of our 9 computers with learners. We'll be using a modem and gaining access to Internet. (Read Write/Now Program, Springfield City Library-Mason Square Branch)
	x	N.S.	Getting a dedicated phone line/modem. Funds to buy more software. (Center for New Americans, Jones Library)
	x		With each proposal we develop, we include resources for new technology. Currently there are no other means available to acquire technology for Lawrence. Four out of the last 5 years, due to inadequate local funding, we have had to raise money to buy books! (Newcomer Family Literacy Project, The Lawrence Public Library)
	x	x	We plan to train tutors more effectively and efficiently in using computers that are available for use in the library. (Literacy Program, Thomas Crane Public Library)
Maryland MD	x	x	N.R. (Project Literacy, Howard County Library)
Michigan MI		x	We struggle to exist now. People in our community expect their taxes to be used for supporting administration of literacy programs. They want their donations to go for direct benefit of the student being served--educational materials and volunteer tutor training. Of course, this doesn't happen without administrative costs. (MARC Literacy Program, Greenville Public Library)

Minnesota MN	x	N.S.	We are developing a program so that the library will have two additional CD-ROM work stations and the Hubbs Center at two computers with direct access to the library catalog (which includes a magazine index and catalogs for other metropolitan public libraries). Within the next two years all the libraries in the city will offer Internet access. At present it is a pilot at the Hamline Branch. (Linking Libraries & Literacy for Lifelong Learning, Lexington Branch Library, St. Paul)
	x	x	We have received a grant for adopting computing for differently abled. We will establish an open computing lab in 1997. (Franklin Learning Center, Franklin Community Library, Minneapolis Public Library)
North Carolina NC	x	x	Applying for grants for software, hardware, distance learning. (Community of Readers, Glenwood Library, Greensboro)
Nebraska NE	N.S.	N.S.	We currently use computers for student lessons and children's educational activities. We plan to eventually get a CD-ROM. Some technology is good for adult literacy, but I do not feel it is as effective as one-on-one tutoring or classes led by a teacher (versus satellite transmitted classes). (Platte Valley Literacy Association, Columbus Public Library)
New Jersey	x	x	Since the literacy program personnel is minimal, and the influx of learners is high, we do not have time to keep the records on computer anymore. (Basic Skills for Reading and ESL, Elizabeth Public Library)
	x	N.S.	Yes, it's not carried out in a vacuum. We are in the process of purchasing more software both kids and adults can use. TV and radio are used by our learners to learn more about their communities via discussion-led group activities. (Literacy for Non-English Speakers, Paterson Free Public Library)
New Mexico NM	x		Working with local university and ABE classes. (LVA-Socorro County, Socorro Public Library)
New York NY	N.S.	x	None. (Literacy Center of Prendergast Library, Jamestown)
	x	x	Seeking out funding for two full-time technology persons and more hardware and software. (Literacy Program, Brooklyn Public Library)
	x	x	In the Fall of 1994, the Centers brought in Dr. John Kruidenier, former director of the Technology Center at NCAL, to evaluate the current status of technology in the program and to prepare a plan that would include long and short term goals. The following activities have been initiated as a result of the report: the purchase of one multi-media computer for each Center, the development of a task group to review and recommend multimedia software, the Bloomingdale and Fordham Centers have gone online as a result of a grant from the NYC Professional Development Consortium,

			and extending computer hours at Centers to increase student access. In addition we plan to work toward achieving the following goals: provide more comprehensive and continuous training for professionals and volunteers, implement a planned computer literacy curriculum for students, continue to upgrade computers at CRW sites, continue to develop Central Software Database, and begin to develop online assessment techniques. (Centers for Reading & Writing, New York Public Library)
Oklahoma OK	x		I have the technology and software now; am in the process of developing such a program (Star-Hartley Invest Learning). (Great Plains Literacy Council, Southern Prairie Library System)
	x	x	We just completed a public fundraiser to raise funds to purchase software for the public computers in the library. (Moore Literacy Council, Cleveland County Library)
	x	N.S.	None at this point; we have neither the funding or the physical space to implement the use of computers in the literacy program. (Literacy Council of LeFlore County, Buckley Public Library)
Oregon OR	x	x	We need to build our new library first, but are researching software and investigating computer space possibilities in this one. (LEARN Project, Eugene Public Library)
Pennsylvania PA	x		(1) RDP has received a LSCA Title VI Library Literacy Programs grant for 1995-96. With LSCA funds, RDP will research adult literacy resources on the Internet, provide Internet training for 24 adult learners and their instructors, and publish the 5th edition of the RDP Bibliography on the Internet. Access will continue beyond the project through the RDP Internet Center. (2) At least four times a year, RDP staff members provide workshops for tutors and teachers. New and significant books are highlighted, but an increasing emphasis is being placed on computer software suitable for adult learners. These workshops will be expanded to a second location where the computers acquired through the Internet project will be used. (Reader Development Program, Free Library of Philadelphia)
	x	x	We would like to train tutors to use computers in our tutor training workshop. We also would like to compile a list of available computer resources (hardware and software) available at local libraries. If we had additional funding, we could purchase software. (Bradford-Wyoming County Literacy Program, Bradford County Library)
Rhode Island RI	x	N.S.	For management applications, a new computer and updated software will produce more professional PR materials; i.e. brochures, flyers, newsletters, reports, letters. An approved grant will provide for acquisition of such technology. (LVA Kent County, Inc., Coventry Public Library)

South Carolina SC	x	N.S.	The Library will acquire instructional audio-video materials and equipment, three computers, literacy software, one set of read-along classics, and necessary books to complete a core print literacy collection. Curriculum is shifting to more use of computers, videos and nonprint materials. Video and audio tapes and equipment are not inexpensive, and are cumbersome to transport. (Literacy Program, Greenville County Library)
Texas TX	x	x	During March of 1996, we will be opening a new Literacy Center to incude a 20-station computer learning lab. (Literacy Center, El Paso Public Library)
	x	x	N.R. (Proyecto Adelante, Weslaco Public Library)
		N.S.	N.R. (Library Literacy Programs, Harris County Public Library)
	x	N.S.	None at this time. (Andrews Adult Literacy Program of Andrews Public Library)
Utah UT	x	x	[Yes, DLT for staff training purposes.] We have applied for a grant that would enable us to purchase educational hardware and software, and training personnel. We currently offer introductory computer instruction in a classroom setting. (Bridgerland Literacy, Logan Library)
Virginia VA	x	x	Provide for student use computer software or basic literacy and pre-GED. (Literacy Program, Newport News Public Library)
Washington WA	x		We plan to provide access to ABE/ESL/GED software on a walk-in and class basis. We will be more attractive because of our increased technology. New learners will come to us to "learn the computer" and will read more as side benefit. (Literacy Program/ Lifelong Learning, Seattle Public Library)
Wisconsin WI	x	x	We are piloting a computer Family Literacy Program, *Families Learn and Earn*, designed to help families gain computer knowledge, upgrade job skills, and interact with their children. Designed for a business site. (LVA Chippewa Valley/Eau Claire, Eau Claire Public Library)
West Virginia WV	x		We would have to pursue this through grants because we don't have the funding to do this. (Literacy Program, Monroe County and Peterstown Public Libraries)

What are the 2-3 most significant barriers you face in bringing about more, and more effective, use of computers and distance learning technology (e.g. lack of software...lack of interest among library management, librarians, or the community...lack of hardware...network access)?

T4 (1)

State Librarians

	C	DLT	
Alabama AL	x		N.R.
Arkansas AR	x	x	In smaller libraries, lack of space.
DC	x	x	Lack of trained literacy professionals. Limited funds for technology purchases.
Delaware DE	x		Ongoing funding to maintain and expand current applications. Knowledge of quality programs which deliver literacy training in technology.
Florida FL	x	x	Lack of hardware, lack of network access.
Georgia GA	x	x	All of the above.
Hawaii HI	x	x	Lack of hardware and network access before February 1996. Lack of quality software. Lack of consensus by literacy providers on technology value.
Iowa IA	x	x	Money. Time for library staffs to learn how to use new technologies. Mindset shift.
Idaho ID	N.S.	N.S.	Lack of fiscal resources. Lack of trained personnel.

Illinois IL	x	x	Training. Uses of technology for literacy training--librarians are adept at using online resources for skill and knowledge building. More partnerships with other agencies. Legislation at the state and federal level clearly a role for libraries.
Indiana IN	x	x	We are in a period of major transition for libraries adapting to new technologies. We need more success stories well publicized in order to get library Boards to make substantial new financial commitments.
Kansas KS	x	x	N.R.
Kentucky KY	x	x	Lack of funding. Lack of expertise. Lack of infrastructure.
Maine ME	x	x	Lack of hardware. Limited staff resources.
Michigan MI	N.S.		Computer equipment requires support personnel for installation and troubleshooting of both hardware and software, and staff is difficult to provide. Also, software is still evolving. Educators and literacy trainers are interested in using new technology, but it is still at an experimental level.
Minnesota MN	x		Lack of awareness of availability of software. Lack of staff at community/neighborhood level to provide support.
Mississippi MS	x	x	The lack of an adequate and accessible training process for front line literacy service providers in library environments.

Montana MT	N.S.	N.S.	Lack of resources and technology for other basic library services. With a lack of such resources for circulation systems, telecommunications, offline bibliographic tools (an offline CD variety) and in some cases even basic telephone service, literacy technology is often far down on the list.
North Dakota ND	x	x	Lack of resources in remote areas.
Nebraska NE	x	x	Lack of funding and staff. We have far more to do than we have resources. We prioritize our work and recognize we can't do all the things we would like to.
New Hampshire NH	x	x	Funding. Training. Time commitment of librarians.
New Jersey NJ	x	x	We need a state plan and the money to invest in the new technology. Lack of funds for hardware and software.
New Mexico NM	x	x	N.R.
Nevada NV	x	x	Funding and training.
Ohio OH	x	x	Lack of information about resources. Unfamiliarity of library personnel of technology as an instructional delivery vehicle. Lack of time/personnel to devote to a "new" service in an already expanding variety of services needed by all patrons.

Oregon OR	x		There needs to be some creative work done on adapting WWW technology to deliver adult literacy training. This would be a real breakthrough.
Pennsylvania PA	x		Lack of hardware, network access, staff, software. General comment: Public libraries can support literacy efforts by working with literacy instruction providers to jointly seek funds to establish computer labs at public library facilities for student and tutor use.
Rhode Island RI	x	x	Fear of computers by providers. Lack of knowledge of potential. Lack of money to promote computer use.
South Dakota SD	x	x	Lack of interest/understanding and the funding necessary for additional network access points.
Tennessee TN	x	N.S.	General lack of interest by library directors. General lack of public awareness of programs provided by libraries.
Texas TX	x	N.S.	Lack of connectivity, infrastructure. Need for training of instructors. Need for quality programming.
Utah UT	N.S.	N.S.	The state has a major educational technology initiative underway on public/higher education. The principal barriers are human, not technical.

West Virginia WV	x	x	Time, staff.
Wisconsin WI	x	x	Uncertainty about sources of funding. Disarray in state government at the moment about which agencies will have responsibility.

What are the 2-3 most significant barriers you face in bringing about more and more effective use of computers and distance learning technology (e.g. lack of software...lack of interest among library management, librarians, or the community...lack of hardware...network access)? T4 (2)

State Library Literacy Contacts

	C	DLT	
Alaska AK	N.S.	N.S.	Lack of $ resources to fund, manage, support, and deliver literacy programming of any kind.
Arkansas AR	x	x	The barrier in small libraries is lack of space. (Identical to Q1)
California CA	x		Lack of appropriate software (improving fast!). Lack of clear understanding at local level of appropriate balance between use of volunteer instructors and technology.
Colorado CO	x	N.S.	Funds for hardware and continuing associated costs.
Connecticut CT	x	x	Funding.
Delaware DE	x	N.S.	Inadequate funding, inadequate staffing, lack of space in some cases.
Florida FL	x	x	Lack of hardware. Lack of network access.
Georgia GA	x	x	All of the above.
Hawaii HI	x		Lack of money, space, and staff.

Iowa IA	x	x	Funding--more computers, better Internet connections. Infrastructure--there is great variation on the quality and level of service from state to state.
Idaho ID	N.S.	N.S.	Lack of adequate funding, not a high enough priority.
Illinois IL	x	x	Lack of knowledge about quality software. Discomfort with technology on the part of librarians and how this addition might increase workloads. Lack of understanding of how they can partner with educators in these technology initiatives.
Indiana IN	x	N.S.	Lack of knowledge of programs and evaluations of their effectiveness. Funding to buy technology. Training to use technology.
Kansas KS	x	x	All of the above.
Kentucky KY	x	x	Lack of funds. Lack of expertise. Lack of interest in agencies with expertise.
Louisiana LA	x	N.S.	Money. Money. Money.
Massachusetts MA	x	x	Understanding of how/value of use to a program. Cost to purchase equipment--also where it will be used (space may be at a premium, and confidentiality an issue). Training is critical.
Maryland MD	x		Inadequate staffing. Adequate training for staff who in turn train users.

Minnesota MN	x		Overcoming hype. Overcoming territoriality. Providing training support to library staff and public.
Missouri MO	N.S.	N.S.	Lack of interest. Lack of hardware. Network access. Training. Local models. Money.
Mississippi MS	x	x	A training mechanism that would enable librarians and those needing literacy training and assistance to use computer hardware and software to their maximum benefit.
Montana MT	N.S.	N.S.	Lack of resources and technology for other basic library services. With a lack of such resources for circulation systems, telecommunications, off-line bibliographic tools (an off-line CD variety) and in some cases even basic telephone service, literacy technology is often far down on list. (Identical to Q1)
North Dakota ND	x	x	Lack of hardware, busy lines.
New Jersey NJ	x	N.S.	Barriers include a lack of hardware and statewide connectivity throughout the state (not just in literacy, in libraries there is tremendous variation).
New Mexico NM		N.S.	Lack of hardware. I perceive a reluctance to purchase hardware for this purpose by some librarians. What software? How effective?
New York NY	x		Lack of hardware, funds for software to dedicate for literacy activities. Impression of librarians and administrators that this will require more "teaching" than other types of software.

Ohio OH	x	x	Lack of information about resources. Unfamiliarity of library personnel of technology as an instructional delivery vehicle. Lack of time/personnel to devote to a "new" service in an already expanding variety of services needed by all patrons. (Identical to Q1)
Oklahoma OK	x	x	Librarians won't let literacy people use the computers. Most small libraries have only one phone line. The one line is used for phone calls, fax, and computers. Literacy people are used to calling the literacy office on our toll-free number. They have resisted accessing information on the computer. Some of the reasons may be fear of failure, long distance charges, unavailability, hassle of learning something new, and cost of appropriate software, modems, etc.
Oregon OR	x	x	Funding for high speed, graphic interface workstations is a barrier, as is lack of knowledge about effective software.
South Carolina SC	x		Cost of equipment. Space to house it. Staffing.
South Dakota SD	x	x	Lack of interest by librarians and the funding necessary for additional network access points. (Identical to Q1)
Tennessee TN	N.S.	x	Technophobia that manifests itself in lack of interest, which in turn restricts budgeting for advanced technology.
Texas TX	x	x	Lack of funding to provide software, hardware, technicians, and training. The libraries are ready, able, and willing--the money is not there.
Vermont VT	No	No	Lack of training of librarians and literacy professionals in use of technology. Lack of public awareness of availability.

Washington WA	x	x	Lack of interest from library management. Lack of interest (and apprehension) from literacy education. Lack of cooperation between libraries and literacy groups.
West Virginia WV	x	x	Funds. At a time when we are holding bake sales to keep the library doors open and staff paid, technology is one more expensive tool. Lack of quality software geared toward the adult learner. There is also some resistance to computer technology by the volunteers who tutor.
Wisconsin WI	x	x	N.R.
Wyoming WY		x	Lack of funds.

What are the 2-3 most significant barriers you face in bringing about more, and more effective, use of computers and distance learning technology (e.g. lack of software...lack of interest among library management, librarians, or the community...lack of hardware...network access)?

State Literacy Resource Centers

	C	DLT	
Alabama AL	x	x	Lack of a strategic planning document incorporating such functions. Funding.
Alaska AK	x	x	Money. Knowledge.
Arizona AZ	x	x	All of above.
California CA	x	x	(1) Lack of understanding on part of literacy service providers of the wide range of uses for programs, for tutors/teachers and for adult learners. Once hooked up and trained, they love it! (2) Some lack the hardware available for their use.
Colorado CO	x	x	(1) Lack of state $ for adult literacy, which leaves our programs underfunded and unable to invest in major technology upgrades. (2) Lack of understanding of value of technology in learning. (3) Lack of basic technology info, not to mention expertise in technology, telecommunications, etc.
Connecticut CT	x	x	Lack of interest and understanding on the part of service providers; lack of trained personnel; lack of funds for hardware.
Delaware DE	x	x	Lack of information about usage, lack of funding for hardware, lack of trained personnel to provide network access.
Florida FL	x		All of the above.
Hawaii HI	x		Lack of hardware and software. Lack of network access. Cautious about technology use.
Iowa IA	x	x	Cost. Ignorance/fear of technology. Resistance to change.
Illinois IL	x	x	Training is the most significant barrier, followed closely by lack of quality courseware at affordable prices and then lack of hardware.

Indiana IN	x	x	#1 Lack of hardware. #2 Lack of community understanding or interest. #3 Lack of understanding or interest among service providers.
Kansas KS	x	x	Lack of funds. Lack of funds. Lack of funds.
Kentucky KY	x	x	Lack of hardware. Lack of trained personnel. Cost effective access to network.
Louisiana LA	x	x	Lack of understanding, experience. Lack of trained personnel. Both of which contribute to lack of prioritization.
Maryland MD	x	x	The lack of understanding and network access have been barriers in the past. However a major goal of Center is to eliminate barriers.
Michigan MI	x	x	(1) Dollars. (2) We (this means all of us) have yet to establish (through research) the link between technology and effective teaching/ learning.
Minnesota MN	x	x	(1) Lack of informed people -- many literacy providers/teachers have Internet access if they only ask the right people the right questions. We're struggling with how to get that message out to the field. Same with teleconferencing facilities. (2) Sense of futility -- there is a sense that everything is going down the drain, that there won't be any funding, and so why should we make a big effort to connect with others in the community.
Missouri MO	x	x	(1) Local programs have different kinds of hardware--much of it is very outdated. (2) Local programs don't have a "computer expert" on site. (3) Need ongoing training in how to use technology. (4) Programs don't have modems. (5) There doesn't seem to be a good source for technology funding. (6) There is very unequal access to technology.
Mississippi MI	x	x	Lack of awareness. Lack of cohesiveness and buy-in.
Montana MT	x	x	Lack of funding; lack of knowledge; need for training.
North Carolina NC	x	x	Lack of hardware. Network access. People know about, want to use these technologies.

North Dakota ND	x	x	Lack of understanding or interest among service providers.
Nebraska NE	x	x	Network access is not a problem, assuming that hardware and software are appropriate; there's a wealth of information available on listservs and bulletin boards not only for instructors but for the students themselves. Greater barriers, I think, include a lack of understanding or interest among service providers (technophobia?), and an overriding lack of quality software, courseware, and even hardware. Following these are issues of lack of trained personnel.
New Hampshire NH		N.S.	Technology is capital intensive. Money is not listed in your e.g. list, but I would suggest in this state that the 3 most significant barriers are money, money, money.
New Jersey NJ	x	x	Lack of resources to obtain appropriate hardware/software and network access. Lack of interested and trained adult education staff.
New Mexico NM	x		Lack of hardware. Lack of quality software/courseware.
New York NY	x	x	N.R.
Ohio OH	x	x	Lack of equipment. Lack of trained staff at local provider sites. Lack of funding.
Oklahoma OK	x	x	Funding. High prices on software. Lack of equipment. Limited or absent network access. Limited media support.
Pennsylvania PA	x	x	Lack of hardware. Lack of training and understanding by providers.
South Carolina SC	x	x	Lack of funding. Lack of funding. Lack of funding.
South Dakota SD	x	x	Funding. Fears of technology by older citizens. Changing old habits of turf -- everyone cooperating for the common good of a literacy population.
Tennessee TN	x	x	Funding. Trained creative service providers. Time.

Utah UT	x	x	Yes to all of above, and varies from site to site. Also, lack of funds.
Vermont VT	x	x	Lack of funding. Lack of training/staffing.
Virginia VA	x	x	(1) Lack of funds to procure computer, modems, software, and Internet connectivity. (2) Lack of training regarding accessing electronic superhighway and the various features the computers have to facilitate information/communication/instruction/research. (3) Lack of understanding how technology use can benefit them. (4) Lack of manpower, trained to use technology equipped systems.
Washington WA	x		Lack of hardware. Lack of trained personnel. Lack of understanding or interest among service providers. Network access.
Wisconsin WI	x	x	Rapid development and change within the technology field. Professional development opportunities for instructional personnel. Lack of standardization of hardware, software, etc.
West Virginia WV	x	x	Lack of funds for software, hardware, and training. Lack of funds for trainers.

What are the 2-3 most significant barriers you face in bringing about more, and more effective, use of computers and distance learning technology (e.g. lack of software...lack of interest among library management, librarians, or the community...lack of hardware...network access)?

	C	DLT	
Arkansas AR	x	x	Lack of courseware at the appropriate level. Lack of understanding among service providers. Lack of trained personnel. Lack of network access. (Reading Together - Arkansas River Valley Regional Library, Dardanelle)
	x	N.S.	Lack of room for literacy office but do not wish to leave library because of resources. (Literacy Council of Hot Spring County, Hot Spring County Library)
California CA	x	x	Lack of funds. (Literacy Program, Napa City County Library)
	N.S.	N.S.	All of your e.g.'s are appropriate. We have a computer center; however, its effectiveness is a mystery to me. The software in the field basically replicates workbooks or is appealing to children. Training of staff is a huge concern not to mention maintenance of equipment. I would like to see more emphasis on computers as a means of communication and building a community of learners, rather than a supplement of repeated frill exercises. (Adult Literacy Program, Alameda County Library, Fremont)
	N.S.		We feel our computers would be better used if we had a centralized computer lab rather than computers dispersed in branches. This would require more space and additional trained personnel and more equipment. At this time, learners have not shown great interest in using our computers in spite of intensive promotional efforts. (Partners in Reading, San Jose Public Library)
	x	N.S.	Lack of hardware, lack of space to house a computer, lack of trained personnel. (Adult Literacy Program, Commerce Public Library)
	x	x	Limited space to provide sites for computer labs at one of our sites. West Marin site has lab for use by students. (LVA Marin County, San Rafael Public Library)
Colorado CO	x	N.S.	Funding & space - software & hardware. We are starting a state literacy listserv and a local-regional home page in January - for literacy information. This is a cooperative project with our regional library organization (Pathfinder). All hardware and software probelms listed in your question. (Literacy Program, Mesa County Public Library District, Grand Junction)
Connecticut CT	x	x	Lack of trained personnel. (LVA-Greater Waterbury, Silas Bronson Library)

Delaware DE		N.S.	N.R. (Project Reads: Sussex County Literacy Council, Sussex County Department of Libraries)
	x		1. Space 2. Up-to-date software. (LVA Wilmington Library)
Florida FL	N.S.	N.S.	Lack of hardware. (Project LEAD, Miami-Dade Public Library System)
	x	N.S.	Money Administrative priorities. (Hillsborough Literacy Council, Tampa-Hillsborough County Library System)
	x	x	Funding for a permanent position to train. Funding for software. We are receiving the Internet but need a trained staff to teach and help patrons. (Panhandle Library Literacy Consortium, Jefferson County Public Library, Monticello)
	N.S.	N.S.	Lack of hardware. (Literacy Program, Brevard County Library, Cocoa)
	x	x	Lack of money for hardware and software. Lack of expansive software based on home and self directed use, free of classroom curricula, testing, monitoring, and philosophies. (Each One, Teach One, Broward County Public Library, Ft. Lauderdale)
	x	x	MONEY. Lack of hardware. Network access. (Center for Adult Learning, Jacksonville Public Libraries)
Georgia GA	x	x	Funding. Lack of technical skills. Personnel - not enough to fully utilize what we have. (Learning Center, Athens-Clarke County Public Library)
	x	x	Lack of funding. (Literacy Program, Sara Hightower Regional Library)
	x	x	Difficulty in identifying effective software for independent use by adult learners. Lack of adequate staff to assist learners as they begin to use computer programs. Lack of Internet access right now, but the library is planning for connection soon. (Literacy Program, DeKalb County Public Library)
Illinois IL	x	x	N.R. (Family Literacy Partnership, Bensenville Library)
	x	x	$ (Libraries for Literacy in Lake County, Waukegan)

Illinois IL (cont'd)	N.S.	N.S.	Barriers to using computers in our program include a physical layout of our library which allows for no separate room where computers could be kept and instruction given in their use or where students could drop in for work on them. There is also lack of quality software at the expense of purchasing necessary equipment. More literacy students could be served in a private manner if it were possible to put into place an effective computerized instructional program. (Literacy Program, Michigan City Public Library)
Indiana IN	N.S.		Fear - students are still afraid of technology. Many volunteers are very much afraid of it, as well. Lack of trained personnel, appropriate software, time. (Literacy Program, Anderson Public Library)
	x	N.S.	Mostly, the barriers to our effective use of these technologies is that the software writers have no appreciation for (some would even say awareness of) those of us who are rural, agrarian, small-town dwellers by choice, and how our view of the world, and its problems, affects the choices we make, on this level, in this place, to address them. (Also see e. above: ...computers are very seductive, but can't learn for us, or teach for us, and they run the risk of homogenizing our culture, dispossessing vital small communities of their memories/ meanings...) (Literacy Program, Knox County Public Library, Vincennes)
Kansas KS	x		Lack of funding. (Project Finish, Johnson County Library, Shawnee Mission)
Massachusetts MS		N.S.	Time for training/time for learners to use computers outside of class times. This year the grant project Computer Connections will address both problems. (Read Write/Now Program, Springfield City Library-Mason Square Branch, Springfield)
	x	N.S.	Lack of funding. Lack of funding. Lack of funding. ...for hardware, software, security, time, training the students to use it... (Center for New Americans, Jones Library, Amherst)
	x		Lack of hardware. (Newcomer Family Literacy Project, Lawrence Public Library)
	x	x	Lack of hardware to run specific software. Lack of computer literacy among older tutors. Lack of trained personnel. Space constraints. (Literacy Program, Thomas Crane Public Library, Quincy)
Maryland MD	N.S.	N.S.	Lack of space and funds, and Inappropriateness of most software for diverse populations. (Project Literacy, Howard County Library, Columbia)

Michigan MI		x	We do not have the space in the library building. We do not have money for purchasing hardware or for maintenance, or for the purchase or downlink fees for receiving the connection. Downlink fee for each access is our barrier. $150 per program is out of our league. (MARC Literacy Program, Greenville Public Library)
Minnesota MN	x	N.S.	At present the major barriers are the problems with the hardware and software--the reliability of their operation. We have wonderful CD ROM products but with several multi-media ROMs on one tower we are having constant problems with them working consistently, so much so that I am having our data processing staff come to remove two multimedia ROMs (out of five) to see if it helps. We all need more training in basic troubleshooting, etc. but it becomes very frustrating when a morning is spent trying to get CD ROMs and printer to work when everything else is neglected. There is no hesitation to use among younger people but older Asian ESL students are not yet comfortable using the computer catalog or ROM products (nor are older white long-time library users). (Linking Libraries & Literacy for Lifelong Learning, Lexington Branch Library, St. Paul)
	x	x	Quality software designed for adult new readers. Network access. (Franklin Learning Center, Franklin Community Library, Minneapolis Public Library)
North Carolina NC	x	x	Most software seems poor. Tutors are not computer literate. Staff is not computer literate enough. (Community of Readers, Glenwood Library, Greensboro)
Nebraska NE	N.S.	N.S.	There is always the lack of funding. Some people in the community might not view it as necessary expenditures. (Platte Valley Literacy Association, Columbus Public Library)
New Jersey NJ	x	x	Better understanding by Literacy Volunteers of Union County of the clientele of learners that comes to the Elizabeth Public Library literacy program would be a plus. The community may not be aware how many people are eager to improve their basic skills and not aware that more hardware and trained personnel would benefit learners in the long term. (Basic Skills for Reading & ESL, Elizabeth Public Library)
	x	N.S.	The major barriers are lack of quality software/courseware, lack of trained personnel, and network access. (Literacy for Non-English Speakers, Paterson Free Public Library)
New Mexico NM	x		Lack of trained personnel and student recruitment. (LVA-Socorro County, Socorro Public Library)

New York NY	N.S.	x	I probably could replace the Apples with more up to date computers but is it really necessary? We have all kinds of software and most of my students may not need anything more sophisticated. (Library Literacy Center of Prendergast Library, Jamestown)
	x	x	NONE other than deafness of educational community to power of technology. (Literacy Program, Brooklyn Public Library, NYC)
	x	x	Lack of funding that would enable the Centers to implement the technology plan within a reasonable time frame. The program has a line for a Technology Specialist; the position has remained vacant since the Fall of 1993. The Centers would benefit from being connected with the Library's Wide Area Network (WAN). More staff development and training in the use of computers for instruction is needed. (Centers for Reading and Writing, New York Public Library, NYC)
Oklahoma OK	x	x	N.R. (Moore Literacy Council, Cleveland County Library)
	x		Only lack of time to learn and develop the program. (Great Plains Literacy Council, Southern Prairie Library System)
	x	N.S.	[Unable to research specific programs...software and hardware increasing and changing at such a fast rate that research would be outdated before it could be implemented.] In addition, we have no space or money for technology. There is little understanding of how important technology can be in supplementing one-on-one instruction and in how important computer literacy is in the total literacy picture. (Literacy Council of LeFlore County, Buckley Public Library)
Oregon OR	x	x	I am not impressed with most software I have reviewed. My grandchildren have delightful learning software developed for children. We do not have adequate space for hardware for public access in this area, but we do have an Internet room with public access.
Pennsylvania PA	x		Lack of adult literacy software evaluation--especially organized printed evaluation guides (not how to evaluate, but actual reviews updated consistently, regularly). Lack of hardware in literacy agencies--RDP can provide software and hardware at its two computer centers for tutors and students to use at the library, but staff for literacy agencies often cannot transfer their experiences with technology to their programs because they lack adequate hardware. (Reader Development Program, Free Library of Philadelphia)
	x	N.S.	The major barriers might be reluctance of volunteer tutors to use technology. We would have to incorporate this into our tutor training workshop. Also the area we serve is rural, so we would have to depend more on local libraries in our system to be resource centers for our volunteer tutors and students. (Bradford-Wyoming County Literacy Program, Bradford County Library)

Rhode Island RI	x	N.S.	Presently, an Apple IIe computer and a good collection of computer software is available to our students. However, the computer is perceived as out-dated and therefore not pertinent to students who may need to work with current technology. A new computer would attract more students--and their tutors. Additionally, a private space for computer/video/tape cassette use would greatly enhance use of the present technology. (LVA Kent County, Coventry Public Library)
South Carolina SC	x	N.S.	Transportation. Our county is very spread out. Expensive high-tech materials are available only at a couple of locations. Also, of course, the general public (tutors and students alike) are terrified of computers. (Literacy Program, Greenville County Library)
Texas TX	x	x	We will have the hardware needed to open the Computer Learning Lab, but additional funding is needed to buy quality software for self-paced instruction. (Literacy Center, El Paso Public Library)
	x	N.S.	N.R. (Proyecto Adelante, Weslaco Public Library)
	N.S.		N.R. (Literacy Programs, Harris County Public Library, Houston)
	x	N.S.	Lack of funds. (Adult Literacy Program of Andrews Public Library)
Utah UT	x	x	We are unaware of any good software for tracking the progress of students and tutors. I think this is one of the most critical needs in the literacy field. (Bridgerland Literacy, Logan Library)
Virginia VA	x	x	There are currently no barriers. The adult literacy program is currently looking into ordering computer software to be used along with what already exists in basic literacy and pre-GED. (Literacy Program, Newport News Public Library)
Washington WA	x		Money for hardware/software is often easier to find than money for staff. (Literacy Program/Lifelong Learning, Seattle Public Library)
Wisconsin WI	x	x	Time - 1st. Lack of trained personnel. Space. Money. Tutor experience. (LVA Chippewa Valley/Eau Claire, L.E. Phillips Memorial Public Library)

West Virginia WV	x	Lack of funding for software, hardware, and trained personnel to help the public. (Literacy Program, Monroe County and Peterstown Public Libraries, Union)

If you want to increase your use of technology, indicate any programs or specific resources currently using technology, if any, upon which you would like to model your technology program.

Local Programs

California CA	We would like to have a computer lab with staff on site. We currently have computers for literacy instruction in two branches. They are not used as well as they could be. (Partners in Reading, San Jose Public Library, San Jose)
Colorado CO	There is already a Justin Lab in our town so another program would be better. Haven't chosen any specific one yet. The school list has computers but most are not available for public use. (Literacy Program, Mesa County Public Library District, Grand Junction)
Florida FL	A learning laboratory. (Hillsborough Literacy Council, Tampa-Hillsborough County Library System, Tampa)
	Learning center - family oriented. Educational software. (Panhandle Library Literacy Consortium, Jefferson County Public Library, Monticello)
Illinois IL	NCAL. (Libraries for Literacy in Lake County, Waukegan Public Library, Waukegan)
Kansas KS	We would like to purchase more PLATO software, the ESL Ellis program, and more video tapes for use in our ESL program. (Project Finish, Johnson County Library, Shawnee Mission)
Massachusetts MA	What our learners want to do is what most people want to do with computers--word processing. (Read Write/Now Program, Springfield City Library-Mason Square Branch, Springfield)
	I would like to comment that there are other technological solutions besides computers. My students find little hand-held "language masters" and translators very helpful. For some students, this is a better solution. (Center for New Americans, Jones Library, Amherst)
Minnesota MN	Programs utilizing all technologies where learners can relate via modem, in person, or by voice mail--crucial. (Franklin Learning Center, Franklin Community Library, Minneapolis Public Library, Minneapolis)
New York NY	I don't know what is available. (Literacy Center of Prendergast Library, Jamestown)
	We are the model. (Literacy Program, Brooklyn Public Library, NYC)
	We would like to connect with programs who are using technology in ways that are compatible with our instructional approaches. The Brooklyn Public Library recently redesigned the technology component of their program--there are aspects of that program that we would like to incorporate into ours. (Centers for Reading and Writing, New York Public Library, NYC)

Oklahoma OK	One in the Fayetteville, AR library. (Great Plains Literacy Council, Southern Prairie Library System, Altus)
	Have not researched specific programs. There is no point until it becomes feasible for our program. The materials, software and hardware, are increasing at such a fast rate that research would be outdated before it could be implemented. (Literacy Council of LeFlore County, Buckley Public Library, Poteau)
Oregon OR	LCC-Emerald Job Center (AFS). LCC Training & Development (displaced worker). (LEARN Project, Eugene Public Library, Eugene)
Pennsylvania PA	RDP has requested information from the Library of Michigan regarding its 7 Internet training centers. If relevant, RDP will adapt the training which is designed for all potential users. (Reader Development Program, Free Library of Philadelphia)
	There are several programs in the state using technology, but most of these are large, urban programs. I'm not aware of any smaller, rural library based programs using technology. (Bradford-Wyoming County Literacy Program, Bradford County Library, Troy)
Texas TX	The El Paso Community College, El Paso Independent School District, and West-Texas Community Supervision and Corrections Department have learning labs which will be used as models for our technology program. (Literacy Center, El Paso Public Library, El Paso)
Utah UT	We are looking at a phonics program (HEC) out of Utah, and the STAR program. (Bridgerland Literacy, Logan Library, Logan)
Virginia VA	Computerized adult testing, assessment and skills enhancement software on disks for pre-GED and Levels I and II and basic literacy. (Literacy Program, Newport News Public Library, Newport News)
Washington WA	Still learning. Any suggestions? (Literacy Program/Lifelong Learning, Seattle Public Library)

In what way would you work with the state library agency and local libraries to implement effective use of technology in library literacy programs?

T6 (3)

State Literacy Resource Centers

Alabama AL	Provide/participate in technological network.
Alaska AK	Not applicable at this point.
Arizona AZ	Via electronic hub we are working on with NIFL and California's OTAN, include the state libraries.
California CA	Expand use of OTAN and see that all library literacy programs are connected. OTAN is the Outreach and Technical Assistance Network in existence for [several] years.
Colorado CO	We could provide information on the use of technology, as well as software, videos, etc. from our lending library. We can coordinate teleconferences. Our state library is very technology-oriented and would help us, rather than us helping them.
Connecticut CT	Plan, coordinate and develop [our plans for achieving greater use of technology]. Link with libraries for loans and circulation.
Delaware DE	Provide information to teachers about library programs; provide libraries with technical assistance.
Florida FL	Providing information and communication to local literacy providers through local library computer systems tied into a statewide network (FIRN).
Hawaii HI	N.R.
Iowa IA	Encourage use and train.
Illinois IL	We are currently gathering data and technology features of public and school libraries in communities with funded literacy programs to evaluate current capabilities and provide the appropriate materials and to look at potential technology capabilities and identify resources to reach that potential. We will also know from this information what types of resource materials we should be purchasing for the SRC collection.
Indiana IN	With funding, would work to conduct how-to-use computer services, how to enter computer dialogue.
Kansas KS	N.R.
Kentucky KY	Sharing expertise and knowledge of technology use in adult literacy programs. Training as developed will become available to staff.
Louisiana LA	N.R.

Maryland MD	The Maryland State Library Agency and local libraries are currently operating The Sailor Network that we will merge with to communicate with local providers.
Michigan MI	We need to be at the planning table.
Minnesota MN	A representative from the state library agency has been at our planning meetings. I'm not quite sure how this will all pull together yet, but libraries are definitely a group that we want involved. In some areas of the state, the libraries would be a downlink site, for example.
Missouri MO	Not sure but would entertain any ideas.
Mississippi MS	As applicable.
Montana MT	Seek matching funds (and/or offer them) to get local libraries on Internet.
North Carolina NC	Expanding Internet access to teachers and learners. Using libraries as distance learning sites.
North Dakota ND	A comprehensive plan to share resources. Joint advocacy of literacy needs. Joint training of staff.
Nebraska NE	We'd be happy to help with identification of e.g. hardware and software needs, assess computer software, link them (through existing library system in the state) to the national literacy network system, etc. We presently have a great deal of material related to instructional technologies of various sorts.
New Hampshire NH	When the Center existed, it could have identified staff training, for effective use, and communicated with libraries through technology.
New Jersey NJ	Developing list of adult education software and video practitioners could borrow/ review at locations convenient to local programs. Jointly sponsored workshops and training.
New Mexico NM	We are now working with the State Library on their Internet Access project which will afford several library literacy programs new access to superior technology.
New York NY	N.R.
Ohio OH	Help provide training. Coordinate linkages of resources.
Oklahoma OK	Training, equipment use.
Pennsylvania PA	State library agency/local libraries would be offered the same services as any other adult basic/literacy education program service.

South Carolina SC	N.R.
South Dakota SD	Online computer access to materials and the use of technology to provide distance learning. Training through the Rural Distance Television Network.
Tennessee TN	We are involved in developing a World Wide Web-based infrastructure of literacy and adult basic education stakeholders, in cooperation with the National Institute for Literacy. As this work expands to the regional and local level, we will be involving libraries in training and using the Internet, specifically the Literacy Information and Communications System (LINCS).
Utah UT	We want to participate in planning and implementation processes.
Vermont VT	Not applicable.
Virginia VA	Sharing cataloging tasks and results; having SLRC records in the library database. Internet connectivity and reciprocal access for each other's information and database.
Washington WA	Unknown.
Wisconsin WI	Library literacy program personnel are invited to participate in staff development activities. Library personnel are included in the required personnel to be invited to serve on collaborative planning teams at the local level.
West Virginia WV	The state library agency relationship has not been strong. Local libraries can (and sometimes do) serve as community sites for training and tutoring. This could be expanded.

In what way would you work with local or state groups (e.g. the state library agency, local libraries, the state literacy resource center or statewide planning body, etc.) to implement effective use of technology in your program?

Alabama AL	N.R. (LVA Anniston Calhoun County)
Arkansas AR	We will work with the State Library and the State Literacy Resource Center to gain access to network and to personnel training. (Reading Together, Arkansas River Valley Libraries for Literacy) Educational shareware, tutor technical training, cooperation between agencies in any way possible (information sharing, etc.), administrative technical training to better program. (Literacy Council of Hot Spring County, Hot Spring County Library)
California CA	State Library - potential funding source. State Literacy Resource Center - source of instructional videos and in-service workshops. (Literacy Program, Napa City County Library) I would like to see adult learners have a serious discussion on how computers are most successful in their learning -- what role it should play in literacy, and how we can effectively incorporate families into a computer program. (Adult Literacy Program, Alameda County Library) I am concerned about the lack of effective administrative software for program management. The California State Library contracted with a software developer over 5 years ago to create a program (CLC-base), but it had so many problems that most programs abandoned it. We now each have to "reinvent the wheel" to get software that collects the data and creates the reports we need for accountability. Much administrative time is spent collecting data for a variety of funders, and the data requested is different for each. (Partners in Reading, San Jose Public Library) I would consider being part of a planning group -- or would develop a formal plan to improve our use of technology. (Adult Literacy Program, Commerce Public Library) Information highway by modem for staff support. (LVA Marin County, San Rafael Public Library)
Colorado CO	We are already ahead of the state on technology, so would consult locally or regionally. Pathfinder regional library system, the Resource Center, other library literacy programs in areas similar to ours. Transportation is such a problem here that multiple sites are used. (Literacy Program, Mesa County Public Library District, Grand Junction)
Connecticut CT	N.R. (LVA-Greater Waterbury, Silas Bronson Library)
Delaware DE	N.R. (Project Reads: Sussex County Literacy Council, Sussex County Department of Libraries, Georgetown) More staff development and volunteer training. (LVA Wilmington Library)

Florida FL

N.R. (Project LEAD, Miami-Dade Public Library System)

Staff training - pre-done modules for training.
Publicity.
Volunteer computer "helpers" - recruitment.
Mandatory training of all staff.
(Hillsborough Literacy Council, Tampa-Hillsborough County Library System)

We have received grants for setting up productive technological programs but when state or federal funding ends we are left with computers and software without funds for a trained personnel for implementing programs and training. (Panhandle Library Literacy Consortium, Jefferson County Public Library)

N.R. (Literacy Program, Brevard County Library)

N.R. (Each One, Teach One, Broward County Public Library)

CAL was initiated in 1984 as a demonstration project under an LSCA Title I grant from the state library. We would be thrilled to be given the opportunity to become a demonstration project again as an example of how a public library can offer instruction to adults in the most technologically advanced methods. Over the past 11 years, many other public libraries have come to us for advice and recommendations in setting up literacy programs similar to ours. We are very glad to be able to share what we have learned with other programs. (Center for Adult Learning, Jacksonville Public Libraries)

Georgia GA

Staff development.
Grant writing.
Shared use of facilities/equipment.
(Learning Center, Athens-Clarke County Public Library)

N.R. (Sara Hightower Regional Library)

We would work with local libraries and literacy providers to develop and implement services which use our technological resources to best meet the needs of adult new learners. (Literacy Program, DeKalb County Public Library)

Illinois IL

N.R. (LVA Elgin, Gail Borden Public Library)

N.R. (Family Literacy Partnership, Bensenville Library)

N.R. (Literacy Program, Libraries for Literacy in Lake County)

Indiana IN

N.R. (Literacy Program, Michigan City Public Library)

N.R. (Literacy Program, Anderson Public Library)

In ways that preserve the integrity of this community and the larger ecology it is part of. Computers are very seductive, but they can't learn for us, or teach for us, and they run the risk of homogenizing our culture, dispossessing vital small communities of their memories/meanings, in order to be able to really reach their audience. (Knox County Literacy Program, Knox County Public Library, Vincennes)

Kansas KS	Decisions regarding technology, including the purchase and use of computers and software, video tapes, etc. are made at the local level. The State Literacy Resource Center would be contacted to help us evaluate software and curriculum and provide samples. (Project Finish, Johnson County Library)
Massachusetts MA	[With a grant from our state library agency, we are working] this year to fully develop the use of our 9 computers with learners. We'll be using a modem and gaining access to the Internet. (Read Write/Now Program, Springfield City Library-Mason Square Branch) I can share the software used here, and see what works in other settings. It would be fun to develop our own software since the quality of what's available isn't impressive. (Center for New Americans, Jones Library) We are currently doing this with the Board of Library Commissioners to offer ESL writing courses using the Internet as a resource. (Newcomer Family Literacy Project, The Lawrence Public Library) Training videos on specific instructional techniques. Information video on learning disabilities and ADD for students, their families, and tutors. Voter information that is easy to understand. I think that working with a technology team would be helpful, but members would need to be located near one another. No long-distance driving to meetings, etc. (Literacy Program, Thomas Crane Public Library, Quincy)
Maryland MD	N.R. (Project Literacy, Howard County Library)
Michigan MI	We can arrange with our local school district or our community college to be the downlink, but do not have money to purchase the service. Possibly work on a committee to investigate networking and reducing costs to agencies who could benefit. $25 per use. (MARC Literacy Program, Greenville Public Library)
Minnesota MN	We have a collaborative process through the Hubbs Learning Center whose Board includes key providers of literacy services in the state such as the Minnesota Literacy Council. (Linking Libraries & Literacy for Lifelong Learning, Lexington Branch Library, St. Paul) Internet access -- complimentary training programs. Connectivity with each other to share curriculum and refer students. (Franklin Learning Center, Franklin Community Library, Minneapolis Public Library)
North Carolina NC	State library could mount information on Internet; coordinate a listserv. (Community of Readers, Glenwood Library)
Nebraska NE	We already cooperate with the local public library when there is a statewide teleconference on workplace literacy, grant writing, etc. We are fortunate to have the technology available at the library, so often they host other community groups here. We would cooperate in any way possible to share the technology that is available. (Platte Valley Literacy Association, Columbus Public Library)
New Jersey NJ	There is not enough time nor personnel to do this, nor a secure computer to accomplish this. (Basic Skills for Reading & ESL, Elizabeth Public Library) We would rely on other groups to provide information on effective technologies to teach reading, English or math. We would network with these organizations to share software, techniques, and discuss the merits of different teaching approaches. (Literacy for Non-English Speakers, Paterson Free Public Library)

New Mexico NM	Request info about effective software for basic reading and ESL. (LVA-Socorro County, Socorro Public Library)
New York NY	If there were any state programs that would show us how such technology would be useful to programs such as ours, I would like to take part. In Western New York, library-sponsored literacy programs seem isolated from one another. There is little networking with the state or with other libraries. (Library Literacy Center of Prendergast Library, Jamestown) We are hosting a technology 5-day training with the Literacy Assistance Center. We publish Techtalk, a staff development tool. (Literacy Program, Brooklyn Public Library, NYC) Technical assistance in the following areas would assist the program in developing a more comprehensive technology component to the program: staff training, identification of appropriate hardware and software, evaluation of students' use of computers, training of students, providing linkages with other literacy organizations implementing technology. (Centers for Reading & Writing, New York Public Library)
Oklahoma OK	N.R. (Moore Literacy Council, Cleveland County Library) Probably call upon their technological expertise. This program is not in use in a library literacy program in my state, to my knowledge. (Great Plains Literacy Council, Southern Prairie Library System) Would research programs throughout the state with the assistance of the state library literacy office. Networking and Internet use could be most effective in instituting a technology program and in expanding services offered to students. (Literacy Council of LeFlore County, Buckley Public Library, Poteau)
Oregon OR	OCCS and Resource Center suggest software. State library has some grants. We would share our information with county libraries. Statewide advisory groups are excellent resources. (LEARN Project, Eugene Public Library)
Pennsylvania PA	RDP will continue to work cooperatively with the National Center on Adult Literacy at the University of Pennsylvania, the Mayor's Commission on Literacy, Drexel University's Community Outreach program, and the many literacy agencies in Philadelphia. To date, RDP has exchanged information, expertise, and resources with these groups. The results of joint projects are publicized through PIVOT, the RDP newsletter, which is distributed to 1300 subscribers locally, nationally, and internationally. (Reader Development Program, Free Library of Philadelphia) N.R. (Bradford -Wyoming County Literacy Program, Bradford County Library)
Rhode Island RI	More effective use of Internet resources and the information available on our state freenet, Ocean State Freenet, would help students and tutors. (LVA Kent County, Coventry Public Library)
South Carolina SC	N.R. (Literacy Program, Greenville County Library)

Texas TX	N.R. (LVA at the Sterling Municipal Library, Baytown)
	We will be working with the Texas State Library, Texas Trans-Pecos Library System, El Paso Community College to implement effective use of technology in our literacy program. Computers will be capable of online connection to the Rio Grande FreeNet for access to the information Super Highway. (Literacy Center, El Paso Public Library)
	N.R. (Proyecto Adelante, Weslaco Public Library)
	N.R. (Literacy Programs, Harris County Public Library)
	N.R. (Adult Literacy Program of Andrews Public Library)
Utah UT	We would use our own resources and local (individual) expertise. (Bridgerland Literacy, Logan Library)
Virginia VA	Volunteer/tutor and library staff training by the appropriate resource person. (Literacy Program, Newport News Public Library)
Washington WA	N.R. (Project READ, Longview Public Library)
	We use the NW Regional Literacy Resource Center for software recommendations and staff trainings. (Literacy Program/Lifelong Learning, Seattle Public Library)
Wisconsin WI	We would work with the State Resource Center and the Statewide Wisconsin Literacy Advisory Council. (LVA Chippewa Valley/Eau Claire, L.E. Phillips Memorial Public Library)
West Virginia WV	State library for training and technical assistance. Network with other local libraries for information about effective hardware and software. (Literacy Program, Monroe County & Peterstown Public Libraries, Union)

CONTENTS
3. Planning

P1 Does your state have a statewide literacy planning body or some coordinated mechanism/integrated planning and resource development on a statewide basis? (Q3)

P2 Is your (state agency, SLRC) a member of a/the statewide literacy planning body/structure? (Q1, Q2, Q3)

P3 Which of the following organizations in your state are involved in cooperative statewide planning, policy, and resource development? (Q3)

P3a Which organizations regularly receive adult literacy services from the SLRC and/or from other state entities?(Q3)

P4 With which of the following organizations in the state does the state library agency maintain ongoing working relations to plan for and otherwise advance adult literacy? (Q1, Q2)

P5 *Congress has cut funding for the state literacy resource centers beginning next year. These centers were a major provision of the National Literacy Act of 1991 which recognized the need for state-level counterparts to the National Institute for Literacy. The centers are presently at various stages of development. Some will survive the federal funding withdrawal, others may not.* If the library agency has a working relationship with the SLRC, please indicate as best you can what kind of help the Center gives you at present (e.g. planning and policy assistance, resource development, program/staff development, help in adapting research to practice). (Q1, Q2)

P6 P6a With which of the following **national** organizations does the (state library, SLRC) maintain ongoing working relations in order to plan for and otherwise advance adult literacy in the state? (Q1, Q2, Q3)

P6b In a sentence or two, what kind of national-level help not now being provided would the state library agency like to have? (Q1, Q2)

P7 Federal funding for the SLRCs was rescinded for FY95 and has not yet been appropriated for FY96. The centers are presently (as of 10/26/95) reauthorized for the period 1997-2002 in bills now pending in the House and Senate. There is thus some chance that funding will be restored in 1997. Moreover, one bill presently under consideration would not place the provision for the centers in block grant funding to the states. The SLRCs are presently at various stages of development. Some are more vulnerable than others to federal funding decisions. How has **your center** and the state's adult literacy affairs already been affected by current federal cuts; what does the future hold if funding is not restored? (Q3 only)

P8 What is the SLRC's specific role in statewide planning, policy, and resource development? (Q3)

P8a Please indicate the SLRC's current annual budget. (Q3)

P9 If the SLRC is technically part of another administrative entity (i.e. is not free-standing) please give the name of the organization it is part of (e.g. state department of education, state coalition for literacy). (Q3)

P10 Please check any of the following services your SLRC provides to literacy planning, policy development, and funding groups in the state. (Q3)

P11 Please check any of the following services that the SLRC provides directly to local literacy programs (regardless of their institutional base). (Q3)

Does your state have a statewide literacy planning body or some coordinated mechanism for integrated planning and resource development?					P1 (3)
	Q3				
	Yes	No	N.S.	No R	
Alabama AL	1				
Alaska AK	1				
Arkansas AR					
Arizona AZ	1				
California CA	1				With great limitation
Colorado CO	1				On policy level, Adult Literacy Commission with broad representation
Connecticut CT		1			Coalition for Lliteracy - defunct
DC					
Delaware DE	1				
Florida FL	1				FL Adult Literacy Policy Academy Team
Georgia GA					
Hawaii HI	1				
Iowa IA	1				
Idaho ID					
Illinois IL	1				
Indiana IN	1				IN Ad Lit Coalition, but form & function disharmonious
Kansas KS		1			Literacy not a priority of governor's office or state board of ed
Kentucky KY	1				
Louisiana LA	1				
Massachusetts MA					
Maryland MD	1				
Maine ME					
Michigan MI	1				
Minnesota MN	1				
Missouri MO	1				
Mississippi MS	1				
Montana MT	1				
North Carolina NC	1				At least working toward it
North Dakota ND		1			Due to personnel changes citizens' advisory & planning body dissolved
Nebraska NE	1				But no systematic effort for integrated planning & res development
New Hampshire NH		1			
New Jersey NJ	1				
New Mexico NM	1				NM Coalition for Literacy Board of Directors
Nevada NV					
New York NY	1				
Ohio OH		1			
Oklahoma OK	1				
Oregon OR					
Pennsylvania PA	1				PA Assn Ad/Contng Ed, State Plan Task Force of PA Dept of Ed
Rhode Island RI					
South Carolina SC	1				
South Dakota SD	1				
Tennessee TN		1			
Texas TX					
Utah UT	1				UT Ad Ed Advisory Bd with mix of CBOs, LEAs, govt agencies, etc.
Vermont VT	1				VT Lit Board/Department of Education
Virginia VA	1				
Washington WA	1				Ad Ed Advisory Council but planning not integrated & comprehensive
West Virginia WV	1				
Wisconsin WI	1				WI Technical College System Board
Wyoming WY					
	34	6	0	0	
	40				
% of Responses	*85*	*15*			

Is your (state library agency, SLRC) a member of a/the statewide literacy planning body/structure in your state?

P2 (1,2,3)

	Q1				Q2				Q3				
	Yes	No	N.S.	No R	Yes	No	N.S.	No R	Yes	No	N.S.	No R	
Alabama AL	1								1				
Alaska AK						1			1				
Arkansas AR	1				1								
Arizona AZ									1				
California CA					1				1				
Colorado CO								1	1				
Connecticut CT						1				1			No statewide body exists.
DC	1												
Delaware DE	1				1				1				Also DE Coalition for Literacy
Florida FL	1				1				1				Until closing 7/31/95
Georgia GA	1				1								
Hawaii HI	1				1				1				
Iowa IA		1			1				1				
Idaho ID	1							1					
Illinois IL	1				1				1				All NETWORK Exec Comm mbrs on Literacy Council
Indiana IN	1				1				1				Ex officio member of IALC
Kansas KS	1				1					1			No statewide body exists.
Kentucky KY	1					1			1				
Louisiana LA					1				1				
Massachusetts MA								1					
Maryland MD		1				1			1				
Maine ME	1							1					
Michigan MI	1							1	1				
Minnesota MN	1				1				1				
Missouri MO					1				1				
Mississippi MS	1				1				1				
Montana MT	1				1				1				
North Carolina NC									1				Part of Workforce Commission
North Dakota ND	1				1					1			No statewide body exists.
Nebraska NE	1							1		1			Attend, give reports, but not members.
New Hampshire NH	1							1		1			No statewide body exists.
New Jersey NJ	1						1		1				
New Mexico NM		1						1	1				SLRC administered by NM Coalition for Literacy
Nevada NV	1												
New York NY						1			1				
Ohio OH	1				1					1			No statewide body exists.
Oklahoma OK					1				1				Resource center included in restructured libr org.
Oregon OR		1			1								
Pennsylvania PA	1							1	1				
Rhode Island RI	1												
South Carolina SC						1			1				
South Dakota SD	1				1							1	SLRC Director on Bd of SD Lit Cncl & works with ABE
Tennessee TN	1							1		1			No statewide body exists.
Texas TX		1				1							
Utah UT	1								1				
Vermont VT					1				1				VT Lit Board oversees SLRC activities.
Virginia VA					1					1			SLRC's input solicited when deemed necessary
Washington WA					1					1	Not invited		and occasionally senior personnel are invited to
West Virginia WV	1				1				1				attend meetings, but SLRC is not a member of
Wisconsin WI	1				1				1				the literacy planning body.
Wyoming WY					1								
Totals	30	5	0	0	26	7	1	10	30	9	0	1	
				35				44				40	
% of Responds	*86*	*14*			*76*	*21*	*3*		*77*	*23*			

Which of the following organizations in your state are involved in cooperative statewide planning, policy, and resource development?																P3 (3)
	Q3															
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	
Alabama AL			1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1		
Alaska AK		1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1 State Legislature
Arkansas AR																2 Governor's office
Arizona AZ	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1		3 State library agency
California CA	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1		1		4 Local libraries
Colorado CO		1	1	1		1	1		1	1			1			5 State Center for the Book
Connecticut CT						1	1	1	1							6 ABE Division/State Ed Dept.
DC																7 Other state agencies/depts
Delaware DE		1														8 Voluntary literacy groups (e.g. LVA, Laubach)
Florida FL	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		9 Community-based organizations
Georgia GA																10 Community colleges
Hawaii HI	1	1	1			1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1		11 Four-year colleges/universities
Iowa IA			1	1		1	1	1		1		1		1		12 State/local ESL groups
Idaho ID																13 Businesses in the state
Illinois IL		1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1			14 Schools
Indiana IN		1				1										15 Other
Kansas KS						1	1									
Kentucky KY	1	1	1			1	1	1	1		1		1		1	
Louisiana LA	1	1	1			1		1	1	1	1		1			
Massachusetts MA																
Maryland MD						1	1	1	1	1						
Maine ME																
Michigan MI		1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1		
Minnesota MN	1	1	1			1		1								
Missouri MO			1		1	1	1	1			1					
Mississippi MS	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		
Montana MT			1													
North Carolina NC		1	1				1	1	1	1	1		1	1		
North Dakota ND		1				1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1		
Nebraska NE		1	1	1		1	1	1		1	1		1	1		
New Hampshire NH						1										
New Jersey NJ						1	1	1			1					
New Mexico NM	1	1	1	1			1	1	1							
Nevada NV																
New York NY	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1				1	1		
Ohio OH	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		
Oklahoma OK			1			1	1									
Oregon OR																
Pennsylvania PA			1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		
Rhode Island RI																
South Carolina SC	1	1				1	1	1					1			
South Dakota SD			1	1		1	1	1	1			1				
Tennessee TN																N.R.
Texas TX																
Utah UT		1				1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1		
Vermont VT	1	1				1									1	
Virginia VA	1	1	1			1		1	1	1		1	1			
Washington WA			1			1	1		1	1						
West Virginia WV		1		1		1	1	1	1			1				
Wisconsin WI	1	1	1			1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1			
Wyoming WY																
	15	**26**	**27**	**17**	**2**	**35**	**31**	**30**	**26**	**22**	**17**	**15**	**19**	**16**	**3**	
% (of 39 resp.)	*39*	*67*	*69*	*44*	*5*	*90*	*80*	*75*	*67*	*56*	*44*	*39*	*49*	*41*	*8*	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Which organizations regularly receive adult literacy services from the SLRC and/or from other state entities?

P3a
(3)

	slrc	ose	slrc	ose	slrc	ose	slrc	ose	slrc	ose	slrc	ose	slrc	ose	slrc	ose	slrc	ose	slrc	ose	slrc	ose	slrc	ose	slrc	ose	slrc	ose	slrc	ose
	1		2		3		4		5		6		7		8		9		10		11		12		13		14		15	
Alabama AL	1		1		1		1				1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1		
Alaska AK																														
Arkansas AR																														
Arizona AZ	1	1	1		1		1		1		1		1		1		1		1		1		1		1		1		1	
California CA					1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1			1	1			1	1		
Colorado CO	1		1		1		1				1		1		1		1		1		1		1		1		1			
Connecticut CT											1		1		1		1													
DC																														
Delaware DE			1								1				1		1		1		1		1		1		1			
Florida FL	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1			1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		
Georgia GA																														
Hawaii HI											1	1		1				1		1		1				1	1	1		
Iowa IA					1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1		1		1		1	1			1		1		1			
Idaho ID																														
Illinois IL			1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1			
Indiana IN		1	1	1							1		1	1	1	1	1	1					1	1			1	1		
Kansas KS							1						1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1		1	1		
Kentucky KY	1	1	1		1		1				1		1		1		1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Lousiana LA					1		1						1	1	1	1	1	1					1	1			1			
Massachusetts MA																														
Maryland MD			1										1		1		1		1		1								1	
Maine ME																														
Michigan MI					1		1				1		1		1		1		1		1				1		1			
Minnesota MN		1		1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1		1	1			1		1		
Missouri MO	1		1		1		1		1		1		1		1		1		1				1				1			
Mississippi MS	1		1		1		1				1		1		1		1		1		1						1			
Montana MT					1			1				1				1														
North Carolina NC		1	1	1		1							1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1			1	1	1	1		
North Dakota ND					1		1				1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1		1		1		1			
Nebraska NE	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1				
New Hampshire NH					1	1	1				1	1					1	1					1				1	1		
New Jersey NJ			1	1							1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1		
New Mexico NM	1		1		1		1						1		1		1		1				1		1		1			
Nevada NV																														
New York NY							1	1			1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		
Ohio OH	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1			1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		
Oklahoma OK	1				1	1	1	1			1		1	1	1	1	1	1		1		1	1		1			1		
Oregon OR																														
Pennsylvania PA							1	1			1	1	1	1	1		1		1		1		1		1		1			
Rhode Island RI																														
South Carolina SC			1	1	1	1	1	1			1		1		1		1				1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		
South Dakota SD	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1			1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1					1	1	1	1	1	1		
Tennessee TN	1		1		1		1				1		1		1		1		1						1					
Texas TX																														
Utah UT			1				1				1	1	1	1	1		1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Vermont VT	1		1		1		1		1		1		1		1		1		1				1		1		1			
Virginia VA					1		1				1		1		1		1		1		1		1		1		1		1	
Washington WA		1		1			1	1			1		1		1		1		1	1	1					1				
West Virginia WV			1								1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1		1		1		1		1			
Wisconsin WI	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1			1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1		
Wyoming WY																														
	15	11	**23**	12	**26**	13	**30**	15	**7**	3	**33**	18	**35**	20	**36**	19	**37**	20	**29**	18	**24**	15	**30**	14	**27**	16	**30**	18	**5**	1
% (of 39 respondees)	*39*		*59*		*67*		*77*		*18*		*85*		*90*		*92*		*95*		*74*		*62*		*77*		*69*		*77*		*13*	

Note: Most 15s = General Public

Note: One D.K. treated as N.R. and not included in table

1	State Legislature
2	Governor's office
3	State library agency
4	Local libraries
5	State Center for the Book
6	ABE Division/State Ed Dept.
7	Other state agencies/depts
8	Voluntary literacy groups (e.g. LVA, Laubach)
9	Community-based orgs
10	Community colleges
11	4-year colleges/univ
12	State/local ESL groups
13	Businesses in state
14	Schools
15	Other

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

With which of the following organizations in the state does the state library maintain ongoing working relations to plan for and otherwise advance adult literacy?

P4 (1,2)

	Q1	Q2	Q1	Q2	Q1	Q2	Q1	Q2	Q1	Q2	Q1	Q2	Q1	Q2	Q1	Q2	Q1	Q2		
	St Leg		Govs Off		SLRC		ABE/EdDept		Vol Gps		CommColl		ESL Orgs		Bus in St		Other			
Alabama AL			1		1		1													
Alaska AK																				
Arkansas AR			1	1	1	1	1	1												
Arizona AZ																				
California CA		1		1		1		1		1		1							SLRC = State Collaborative Lit Council	
Colorado CO				1		1		1		1		1		1		1			to which SLRC reports	
Connecticut CT								1				1								
DC	1				1		1		1				1				1		Other = SLRCs	
Delaware DE			1	1					1	1			1							
Florida FL	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	*SLRC now defunct/closed	
Georgia GA							1	1	1	1			1	1					Other = Dept Elder Services,	
Hawaii HI	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1			Corrections, Labor, HRS	
Iowa IA		1		1	1	1		1		1		1		1		1				
Idaho ID					1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1		1	Other = ID Coalition for Lit	
Illinois IL	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		Other=Depts Employment	Security, Corrections, Commerce
Indiana IN	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1					1	1		1	Other = St Lit Coalition	/& Community Affairs, Public Aid
Kansas KS	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1		1		1		1	Other = Regional ABE	PTA, IL Libr Assn, foundations
Kentucky KY	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1			
Louisiana LA		1		1		1		1		1										
Massachusetts MA		1		1		1		1		1		1		1		1		1	Other = NCAL Interagency Lit Proj	
Maryland MD																				
Maine ME	1		1				1		1				1				1		Other = Lit Coalition	
Michigan MI	1		1		1		1		1						1		1		Other - Libr of MI Fndtn	
Minnesota MN					1	1	1	1	1		1		1					1	Other = MN Lit Council, Assn Cont/Ad Ed, Reading Assn,	
Missouri MO						1		1		1										Libr Assn, Cntr for Book, etc
Mississippi MS			1	1	1	1					1	1					1	1	Other = MS Asn Ad & Comm Educators	
Montana MT			1	1	1	1													North MS Lit Alliance	
North Carolina NC								1								1			ABE Businesses = Sort of	
North Dakota ND			1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1			1		1	1				
Nebraska NE	1		1		1		1		1						1					
New Hampshire NH	1		1		1		1		1		1		1		1		1		Other = nonprofit lit council	
New Jersey NJ								1	1	1										
New Mexico NM	1	1	1	1	1	1												1	Other = NM Coalition Lit	
Nevada NV	1		1		1		1		1		1		1		1					
New York NY		1				1				1										
Ohio OH					1	1	1	1			1	1	1	1	1	1				
Oklahoma OK		1		1		1		1		1				1				1	Other = OK Lit Coalition,	OK Lit Init Commission
Oregon OR		1				1	1	1	1	1	1	1								
Pennsylvania PA					1		1										1		Other = PA St Coalition Ad Lit	
Rhode Island RI	1		1		1		1		1										PA Assn Ad/Cont Ed	
South Carolina SC		1		1		1		1												
South Dakota SD	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1			1	1	1				
Tennessee TN	1				1	1	1	1										1	Other = TN Lit Coalition, Assn Ad/	
Texas TX	1		1															1	Other = TX Libr Assn	Comm Ed
Utah UT							1										1		Other = various grps via statewide planning body	
Vermont VT		1		1		1		1				1		1		1		1	Other = ABE Centers, VT Cntr for Bk	
Virginia VA						1		1												
Washington WA						1		1				1								
West Virginia WV		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1			1		1					
Wisconsin WI			1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1				1				
Wyoming WY		1		1		1		1		1		1		1		1				
Q1 Totals	17		23		27		27		23		13		15		14		9			
Q1 % (of 35)	*49*		*66*		*77*		*77*		*66*		*37*		*43*		*40*		*26*			
Q2 Totals		18		24		31		32		24		18		14		17		12		
Q2 % (of 44)		*41*		*55*		*70*		*73*		*55*		*41*		*32*		*39*		*27*		

Congress has cut funding for the state literacy resource centers beginning next year. These centers were a major provision of the National Literacy Act of 1991 which recognized the need for state-level counterparts to the National Institute for Literacy. The Centers are presently at various stages of development. Some will survive the federal funding withdrawal, others may not. If the library agency has a working relationship with the SLRC, please indicate as best you can what kind of help the Center gives you at present (e.g. planning and policy assistance, resource development;, program/staff development, help in adapting research to practice). (Q1, Q2)

P5
(1)

State Librarians

Alabama AL	Our Center provides no help to us. However, recent lines of communication have opened and it is likely that there will be increased cooperation in the future.
Arkansas AR	The Arkansas Adult Learning Resource Center provides the State Library with statistics and research data as needed.
DC	DCPL, as the state library, is the site of the DC Literacy Resources Center. The focus has been to house materials of interest to, and for the professional development of, literacy practitioners in DC, and to organize and provide resources and staff development training.
Delaware DE	N.R.
Florida FL	They were doing little for state library agency; mainly focused on teachers and school district personnel and some volunteer support agencies on literacy.
Georgia GA	The center closed.
Hawaii HI	Hawaii State Public Library System is the state literacy resource center.
Iowa IA	Resource development. Provides a library presence in literacy circles. Gives libraries opportunity to participate in/support local literacy activities w/o large investments in materials collections.
Idaho ID	No opinion.
Illinois IL	We operate the center and actively lobbied to have this responsibility....with the general downsizing of state government and the already strained finances to run all the literacy programs we currently operate as well as fund our visions for the future, it will be very difficult to continue to fund this center without federal support. It took great energy to get this started and while it won't totally cripple our program, the timing is poor.

Indiana IN	The SLRC is so located in the State Library with funding from 5 agencies including the State Library. I serve as Vice President of the Literacy Foundation, co-chair of the IN Adult Literacy Coalition, and a board member of the Steering Committee of the State Resource Center. The Center will survive, the State Library will "grow" the relationship with the Resource Center, particularly using automation. The Resource Center has developed a "home page" on the State Library server and we are investigating how to put the Center's holdings in the State Library Catalog as a "branch" of the State Library.
Kansas KS	N.R.
Kentucky KY	N.R.
Maryland MD	N.R.
Maine ME	N.R.
Michigan MI	The SLRC in Michigan provided a focus for planning and coordination of effort. Most importantly for the Library of Michigan, and for the Library of Michigan Foundation, it provided academic research staff to assist with the evaluation of programs funded by Foundation grants. This provided independent verification of the results of LM Foundation adult literacy grants. The SLRC also disseminates evaluation data and innovative/effective techniques and provides training to providers.
Minnesota MN	We are a major partner in the Minnesota-South Dakota Adult Literacy Center. We share staff and space in that resources are cataloged into our online catalog system and available to literacy providers around the state.
Mississippi MS	The SLRC has provided: reference and referral services, Director of Literacy Resources in MS, a bibliography of materials at the Center, updates on activities through its newsletter (*Literacy, A Mississippi Newsletter*). The SLRC is also involved in the collaborative efforts of the *Interagency Staff Development System*.
Montana MT	Currently we are the state's literacy resource center. However, we are working to produce an RFP to allow other entities to "bid" to be our SLRC. We do not have the resources sufficient to commit to this activity to do it well.
North Dakota ND	Resources.
Nebraska NE	None. However, we do not have any literacy programs under our direction.
New Hampshire NH	Resource development, staff development, mobilizing telephone and letter campaigns for legislative influence.

New Jersey NJ	N.R.
New Mexico NM	N.R.
Nevada NV	Interlibrary loan, marketing through libraries.
Ohio OH	Our work with the SLRC has been handled by two people, the former state librarian who served on the SLRC advisory, and the consultant for Library Programs & Development who works with the staff at SLRC. We have provided the money to underwrite a resource manual which was distributed to all public library systems in the state and have underwritten the cost of twenty persons to attend a "Family Literacy Workshop". SLO and SLRC staff confer on various topics and information is shared between the two groups.
Oregon OR	We sought a role in this but lost out to our Office of Community College Services. That is when we lost contact with the program here. I have no idea how the funds were spent or whether they did any good.
Pennsylvania PA	Commonwealth libraries administer Pennsylvania's SLRC for the Department of Education's Bureau of Adult Basic and Literacy Education. The SLRC provides assistance to library literacy programs in the state, including resource development, staff development, help in adapting research to practice, and planning.
Rhode Island RI	Center is still getting itself organized. I feel that we give the Center help rather than vice versa.
South Dakota SD	The SLRC continues to provide limited program/staff development. Resource development/sharing is being provided through access to materials for new readers, professional staff and volunteer staff by means of the South Dakota Library Network (SDLN) online library access catalog.
Tennessee TN	We are kept informed concerning planning, policy development, resource and program development. We have a staff member who serves on the policy committee.
Texas TX	N.R.
Utah UT	N.R.
West Virginia WV	Bringing the statewide network of libraries into programs--all libraries are a first point of contact for adults needing assistance. All libraries strive to offer place, people, and resources.
Wisconsin WI	Not much, but it's been a struggle for the Center to define its mission and get off the ground.

P5 (2)

Congress has cut funding for the state literacy resource centers beginning next year. These centers were a major provision of the National Literacy Act of 1991 which recognized the need for state-level counterparts to the National Institute for Literacy. The Centers are presently at various stages of development. Some will survive the federal funding withdrawal, others may not. If the library agency has a working relationship with the SLRC, please indicate as best you can what kind of help the Center gives you at present (e.g. planning and policy assistance, resource development; program/staff development, help in adapting research to practice). (Q1, Q2)

State Library Literacy Contacts

Alaska AK	n/a
Arkansas AR	The Arkansas Adult Learning Resource Center provides the State Library with statistics and research data as needed. (Identical to Q1)
California CA	Most of all it offers the potential for coordinated literacy development statewide. State Department of Ed has (and still does) controlled federal ABE-literacy funds, and tends to support LEA-based instruction. These are primarily ESL and ABE. SLRC (State Collaborative Literacy Council) brings wide range of agencies together as equals, one of which is State Dept. of Ed. I hope SLRC will evolve into the central coordinator of literacy activities, including serving as vehicle for distribution of federal literacy funds.
Colorado CO	Collection development, newsletter, bibliographies (e.g. family literacy), and reference research.
Connecticut CT	N.R.
Delaware DE	N.R.
Florida FL	Florida's Center closed June 30, 1995. The Center never quite earned the status of being "the central, one-stop shopping place" for literacy providers and supporters to go to for information, training and/or other local needs. The State Library (literacy consultant) worked with Florida Literacy Resource Center staff on various state level committees, boards, etc., and stayed current on issues and trends which impacted center services. However, directly, the Center never provided any kind of service to the State Library.
Georgia GA	The Center closed.
Hawaii HI	Minimal practical assisting. More coordination of meetings between groups. Need greater networking and cooperation.
Iowa IA	The SLRC is the lead agency for literacy services in Iowa.
Idaho ID	Information about literacy (mostly training) issues, access to instructional networks.

Illinois IL	The Illinois State Library was selected by the Governor's Office to operate Illinois' SLRC, known as The NETWORK. The Executive Committee is made up of the Secretary of State Literacy Office, the Illinois State Board of Education, the Illinois Community College Board, the Illinois State Library, and the Adult Learning Resource Center. We provide technical assistance and coordination of staff development activities. The Advisory Group of the NETWORK determined that technology and learning disabilities were two areas they wanted comprehensive staff development on. We've also combined resources with 353 funding to grant funds for training the trainer projects to increase the more cost effective delivery of staff development. Our work over the past four years has brought all players including libraries and volunteer organizations into the adult literacy delivery system. The groundwork has been laid for accessing a variety of resources to expand the effectiveness of the system.
Indiana IN	Collects materials in literacy area, and since they are housed in State Library, we don't have to collect these materials. Provides hotline referral to local library programs. Provides basic consultation services.
Kansas KS	Our resource center sponsors a yearly adult education institute...a week-long, fairly intensive workshop-driven opportunity for ABE, corrections, welfare...
Kentucky KY	N.R.
Louisiana LA	We have a good working relationship with the SLRC. In resource development, we, the State Library, actually perform the functions of selecting, cataloging, listing, housing, and disseminating resource materials to agencies, organizations, tutors, and learners. The SLRC, funneled through the Governor's Office of Lifelong Learning, perhaps is an unnecessary step in the deployment of the federal monies. The OLL has done effective work networking, and by providing 3 conferences in the past 30 months. The SLRC therefore helps make available some resources, but another way might be more efficient. The SLRC would survive federal funding withdrawal thanks to the previous, ongoing, and future existence of the resources of the State Library of Louisiana.
Massachusetts MA	We have a cordial but not close relationship, since our agency was active long before the establishment of the SLRC. We mainly sit on statewide literacy planning boards together and write support letters for projects/grants as needed.
Maryland MD	Information updates.
Minnesota MN	Resources in literacy, promoting understanding and service from within library community, contact with literacy field.
Missouri MO	We are involved with our state literacy resource center in several ways. First, we are team members with them in planning and executing statewide and/or regional conferences. We have attended several of their family literacy training sessions. And, we call upon them from time to time for referrals, updates on federal legislation, and to share information for our publications.

Mississippi MS	The SLRC has provided reference and referral services, Directory of Literacy Resources in MS, a bibliography of materials located at the Center, and updates on activities through its newsletter (*Literacy, A Mississippi Newsletter*). The SLRC is also in the collaborative efforts of the *Interagency Staff Development System.* (Identical to Q1)
Montana MT	Currently we are the state's literacy resource center. However, we are working to produce an RFP to allow other entities to "bid" to be our state's LRC. We do not have the resources sufficient to commit to this activity to do it well. (Identical to Q1)
North Dakota ND	Resource development.
New Jersey NJ	No working relationship at present.
New Mexico NM	Program development - it is a place from which libraries may borrow material to determine its usefulness.
New York NY	Provides grant reviewers. Sponsored a graduate level course that I attended. (I was part of the TV studio audience of 6.) It was valuable to have library representation seen statewide. Regional consortia include libraries in their mailings.
Ohio OH	Our work with the SLRC has been handled by two people, the former state librarian who served on the SLRC advisory, and the consultant for Library Programs and Development who works with the staff at SLRC. We have provided the money to underwrite a resource manual which was distributed to all public library systems in the state and have underwritten the cost of twenty persons to attend a "Family Literacy Workshop". SLC and SLRC staff confer on various topics and information is shared between the two groups. (Identical to Q1)
Oklahoma OK	The OK Literacy Resource Center is located at the OK Dept. of Libraries and is "overseen" by the Library Literacy coordinator. The Center staff coordinates activities with library literacy staff to avoid duplication and better collaboration. The two offices will merge in November and will still offer technical assistance, grants and scholarships, newsletters, training and information to literacy programs throughout the state.
Oregon OR	Oregon participates in a regional literacy resource center. The Northwest Regional Literacy Resource Center in Seattle produces a resource book that is helpful for research and planning purposes. The Center cooperated in making the resource manual available to Oregon public libraries that wished to receive a copy. We have not requested or pursued other assistance from the Center.
South Carolina SC	They have promoted little outside the education community.

South Dakota SD	SLRC continues to provide limited program/staff development. Resource development/sharing is being provided through access to materials for new readers and professional staff by means of the South Dakota Library Network (SDLN) online library access catalog. (Identical to Q1)
Tennessee TN	I serve on the policy team for Tennessee. I refer individuals to them for resources not readily available to me.
Texas TX	We do not collaborate directly with the SLRC of Texas.
Vermont VT	The Center makes books and pamphlets available for statewide circulation by including them in the Department of Libraries' catalog/database. Public libraries all receive the Center's newsletter. The Center sponsored an interagency conference on literacy this fall, and public librarians attended.
Virginia VA	The Library of Virginia assists the LRC re automation and networking.
Washington WA	Our state literacy center provides collection assistance to library staff, attends library conferences and workshops, serves as instructors and panelists for training programs, and provides catalogs of the Center's materials to libraries.
West Virginia WV	West Virginia's SLRC is still in the development stage. We are in contact with the individuals but have not been directly benefited by this center. I worry that any cuts in the funding to support this center will damage any future growth and/or support.
Wisconsin WI	Not much, but it's been a struggle for the Center to define its mission and get off the ground. (Identical to Q1)
Wyoming WY	Awareness. Perhaps resources could be used more efficiently if the State Library were included in the SLRC's activities rather than duplicating services of each.

P5a
(3)

Federal funding for the SLRCs was rescinded for FY95 and has not yet been appropriated for FY96. The centers are presently (as of 10/26/95) reauthorized for the period 1997-2002 in bills now pending in the House and Senate. There is thus some chance that funding will be restored in 1997. Moreover, one bill presently under consideration would not place the provision for the centers in block grant funding to the states. The SLRCs are presently at various stages of development. Some are more vulnerable than others to federal funding decisions. How has **your center** and the state's adult literacy affairs already been affected by current federal cuts; what does the future hold if funding is not restored?

Alabama AL	N.R.
Alaska AK	We (the SLRC) give 100% of our funds to our regional center (Northwest Regional Literacy Resource Center at network in Seattle) so the funding cut will not affect statewide operations.
Arizona AZ	[The] Adult Literacy & Technology Resource Center, Inc. [has already] lost $103,722.
California CA	SLRC-California is now in 3rd year of federal funding and is secure as exists now through September 1996. If funding is not allocated as specific set-aside in block grants, not yet clear at what level SLRC will be maintained. Clearly will not disappear but not sure at exactly what level funding will be. The State Collaborative Literacy Council, which was created to administer SLRC, is committed to continuing the effort no mater what happens to federal $ but has not yet been able to develop a concrete plan for beyond Sept. 30, 1996.
Colorado CO	Direct effects not yet felt, but since we are totally federally funded, loss of these dollars means our demise. Block grants to governor's office more than likely dooms us as well. We have lost adult education for homeless $.
Connecticut CT	Funding for the position of state literacy coordinator and for materials is gone. If federal funding is not restored, the literacy resource center will continue to be funded by the Capitol Region Education Council and by sale of services to agency members of the Resource Center. This is the means currently being employed to sustain the Center for FY95-96.
Delaware DE	No money for providing programs -- e.g. consultants, conferences.
Florida FL	The Florida Adult Literacy Resource Center closed July 31, 1995 as a result of the federal budget rescission of 1995. This took away a catalyst which was just beginning to inform a well developed public/private partnership. This took the better part of three years. Loss of this resource will set the state's literacy delivery system back to its former random and inequitable approach to development. (Former Director, FL SLRC)
Georgia GA	Letter from Asst Commissioner: The Georgia Literacy Resource Center is temporarily closed, due to termination of federal funding. Center activities will resume as funds are identified and made available, and program operations re-structured to meet program goals. Currently, on-going staff development workshops for adult literacy practitioners are being developed and conducted at the resource center as part of our adult literacy program activities. Specific program operations will resume contingent upon the new funding sources.

Hawaii HI	N.R.
Iowa IA	1. No impact through June 1996. 2. After June 1996, 50-75% cut in funds anticipated: reduction in staff, services, acquisition. 3. After June 1996 operations will be restricted to maintenance level: check-in/out, little if any acquisition, promotion etc. unless funding restored.
Illinois IL	Depending on the legislation which emerges related to State Resource Centers, our agency may or may not be the SRC in the future. If dollars for SRC's go to SEA's that agency in Illinois will probably operate the SRC. The work we've done over the past 3 1/2 years will impact the way that ISBE would run a state resource center. We anticipate that services of the SRC would be open to all partners in the adult literacy/education arena and not just LEA's. There would also be an emphasis on funding projects or activities in the train-the-trainer mode. The Interagency Coordinating Committee of the Illinois Literacy Council would, I trust, continue in some form to ensure this ongoing coordination.
Indiana IN	Change of administration. Reduction in staff (from 10 to 2.5). Additional potential downsizing if funding not restored.
Kansas KS	Our SLRC was an expansion of the existing Adult Education Resource Center funded with 353 funds. When the federal funds dry up, it will go back to being the Adult Education Resource Center if Adult Ed funds can still be used for that purpose under the new legislation.
Kentucky KY	The Kentucky Center for Adult Education and Literacy will continue services to local providers at a minimal level. The materials collection will be maintained, with few new acquisitions. Newsletters, publications, and trainings will be continued through cost recovery. Technical assistance, research, and policy planning will be continued as special project funds are received.
Louisiana LA	Unless the 1996 Regular Session of the Legislature restores General Fund appropriation, the Center will "sunset" in September of 1996. A new administration will take office on January 8.
Maryland MD	Federal funding for the SLRC ended June 30, 1995. As a result, services have been reduced. Currently monies are being used to provide a comprehensive professional staff development program. We have limited materials purchasing and distribution and have consolidated three regional centers into two.
Michigan MI	The State of Michigan immediately replaced much of the "lost" federal funds and our Dept. of Education will continue to do so. Budgets will be reduced by 1/2 in the future (beginning in January). Result: services to the field will be fee-based, graduate assistantships go from 2 to 1, will not be sponsoring dissertation research, will not be sponsoring teacher field-based inquiry.

Minnesota MN	Our budget has been cut to about a third of its previous level, and our staff has been cut from two to one person. We are currently funded with section 353 money. Complicating matters in MN, our Department of Education was abolished as of 9/30/95, and we now have a Department of Children, Families, and Learning. The new department combines the old dept. of ed. with programs related to youth and families from Health and Human Services, and Labor. With this restructuring is a reexamination of how the agency is spending its dollars. Combined with the uncertain federal situation, I am pessimistic about our center's ability to continue without the reauthorization and set-aside funding. Our center is too new to be effective at finding alternative (non-government) funding sources.
Missouri MO	We are a nonprofit and raise funds year round. State has begun giving small grant ($70,000). State DESE helps with funds. Adult literacy has gone to the state for an increase in funding to compensate for loss of [federal] funds.
Mississippi MS	Shaky. (1) We have funding for some staff through June 30, 1996. (2) We are writing grant applications for FY96-97. (3) We have proposed legislation being written.
Montana MT	So far, not affected. We did not use '94 funding, and we have requested and received permission to extend period of time during which these funds may be expended.
North Carolina NC	Because we are very new (June 1994) we are still using FY1994 funds and will be in business through Sept. 1996. After that our future is unclear. If federal funding is restored, we are likely to remain operative; if not I do not know what will happen. NC is undergoing changes in community college structures which would affect us, and the Workforce Commission may want to redesign our affiliation.
North Dakota ND	N.R.
Nebraska NE	Presently, we have already experienced a reduction in the kinds and amount of staff development opportunities we can offer. We have reduced Center staffing (some clerical support) and have reassessed our priorities in terms of purchasing materials for program use across the state. We anticipate continuing to function as the SLRC through next spring, using carry-over monies from FY94-95, but with a reduction in outreach. Future: When these funds have been exhausted, we will revert back to the primary research and development function which our Institute held prior to being identified as the SLRC for Nebraska. This would mean no longer purchasing any materials for use in the lending library, further reductions in staff, and reducing or eliminating many other outreach efforts.
New Hampshire NH	The Center was not funded for FY96. The Center will continue to be closed if funding is not restored.

New Jersey NJ	Our SLRC is currently operating on FY94 grant monies. Thus all SLRC functions related to training and technical assistance will continue. These functions are currently supported by funds provided through the Adult Education Act, Section 353 and will not be affected if funds are not restored. Activities related to governmental and agency cooperation will continue, but on a more restricted basis as other resources allow. Library services provided will become limited to the time staffing resources will allow.
New Mexico NM	The Coalition received a total of over $130,000 over the past 3 years for the SLRC. No additional state funding has since been allocated to support this program. The approximate 30% increase in training, technical assistance, and related services realized in each of the past 3 years will be lost, and without other funding to replace the SLRC funds, cutbacks will be made in staffing, training, and materials purchases.
New York NY	The Center is currently operating on "no cost extension" of FY94 SED and DSS Funds. As of 12/30/95 these extensions end and the NY SLRC will cease to exist. The School of Education-SUNY Albany is seeking foundation funding to develop a resource center. However, should such funding be realized, the Center's relationship with NYSED will have to be determined.
Ohio OH	We are continuing at 70% level this year with 353 funds and state match in state budget. We anticipate similar funding for another year after this one.
Oklahoma OK	Caused reduction of staff (50%). Services are limited by lack of research time and preparation of papers. Funding adequate until 9-30-96. I anticipate that Center will close if funding not forthcoming.
Pennsylvania PA	Presently the SLRC function is being funded by carryover funds from the previous federal grant(s). The SLRC function in PA is being "scaled back," and other funding to support the functions is being pursued. Under current funding constraints it is expected that the SLRC function will be limited to just publication and dissemination of 353 projects for FY96-97.
South Carolina SC	Our funding has been cut by more than half, but our workload has more than doubled. We are finding ourselves providing training for regular K-12 teachers to justify the SDE picking up the slack in our funding.
South Dakota SD	No additional materials purchased for use by literacy councils. No funds for training are available. The literacy resource center will continue to assist providers with location and access to existing materials as its only responsibility. No state funds will be made available.
Tennessee TN	We have no SLRC funding for this FY, but the Center for Literacy Studies continues with other funding to do some of the same work (but not all). Without federal funding we expect future work of the Center for Literacy Studies to be less state-focussed, providing fewer resources to Tennessee literacy programs.

Utah UT	The bulk of our funds are federal; however, we remain very optimistic and are carrying on with same level of funds.
Vermont VT	Vermont received such a small SLRC grant - $18,000 - that the loss of the money was not a crisis. The funding was used to implement the workplan of the Vermont Literacy Board (as outlined earlier). We need to fundraise to support the newsletter and our director is unable to attend staff development events (such as conferences), and our support of the New England Literacy Resource Center was cut.
Virginia VA	Massive cuts in this year's budget meant personnel reduction (support staff) and reducing a full-time librarian's job into a part-time position--which will slow down the process of getting the Center's holdings (about 12,000 titles) online and converting records into MARC. Services are affected and certain components of our project (i.e., the field-testing and evaluation of instructional materials by some 25 teachers statewide) have to be deleted from the budget. Production of the Learning Resources Evaluation Manual and the AE Curricula Resource Catalog (an annually produced product) was also deleted from the budget. Travel for staff has been drastically cut (with some professional staff with no travel at all in the budget), thus restricting the training activities we'd aggressively targeted in our plan to a minimum. Also, there's no money for promotional products for the SLRC, and no money for external evaluation and marketing to build awareness. If the SLRC funding is not restored, our SLRC cannot meet the needs of our AE and literacy field. We cannot expand services and be state-of-the-art.
Washington WA	Budget reduced - RLC $ replaced by 4 states, mostly w/353 $. Intent for 7-1-96 to 6-30-97 is to continue to operate as a state center.
Wisconsin WI	The WI Literacy Resource network staffing has been dramatically scaled back. Adult education program planning is conservative,with no planned increase in funded services. Volunteer literacy organizations are becoming more involved in local and state planning and service delivery. The state has adopted a posture which would not replace funds lost by federal cuts. The assistant state director of the WI Technical College System Board is actively involved in interagency planning.
West Virginia WV	Technically, our center no longer exists. Almost all of our funding went directly to providers for training, materials, and maintenance of an 800 adult education phone line (as well as a statewide newsletter, Networks). All of these services will be drastically cut or they will end without future funding.

With which of the following national organizations does the state library maintain ongoing working relations to plan for and otherwise advance adult literacy?

P6 (1,2)

	Q1	Q2	Q1	Q2	Q1	Q2	Q1	Q2	Q1	Q2	Q1	Q2	Q1	Q2	Q1	Q2	Q1	Q2	Q1	Q2	Q1	Q2	
	ALA		**NIFL**		**USEd**		**NCAL**		**CAL-ESL**		**NCforLit**		**LVA/Laub**		**NCLIS**		**Ctr fr Bk**		**Business**		**Other**		
Alabama AL	1				1										1		1						
Alaska AK																		1					
Arkansas AR	1	1			1	1									1	1							
Arizona AZ																							
California CA		1		1		1							1				1		1				
Colorado CO				1		1		1						1							1		Ntl Ctr Fam Lit, Natl Homeless Coalition
Connecticut CT		1				1								1		1		1					
DC	1		1		1		1		1		1		1		1		1						
Delaware DE					1										1								
Florida FL	1	1			1	1							1	1	1		1	1	1	1			
Georgia GA	1	1	1	1	1	1																1	Note: Ntl Coalitn Lit was influential in
Hawaii HI	1	1	1		1						1		1		1	1	1		1	1			getting libraries involved, but haven't
Iowa IA	1	0		0		0		0		0		0		0	1	0		0		0		0	seen much activity in past few years
Idaho ID	1	0		0	1	0	1	0		0		0	1	0		0	1	0	1	0		0	
Illinois IL	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1			
Indiana IN	1	1		1	1	1								1	1	1	1	1					
Kansas KS	0		0		0		0		0		0		0	1	0		0		0		0		
Kentucky KY	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1			
Louisiana LA		1		1		1		1								1		1					
Massachusetts MA		1		1		1		1		1		1		1									Bus = not since demise of BCEL
Maryland MD	0	1	0		0	1	0		0		0		0		0		0	1	0		0		
Maine ME	1				1						1		1				1				1		Other=ME Lit Coalition
Michigan MI			1				1										1						
Minnesota MN	1	1	1		1	1	1								1	1	1	1					
Missouri MO																		1					
Mississippi MS	1	1			1	1																	
Montana MT	1	1			1	1									1	1	1	1					
North Carolina NC																							
North Dakota ND	1				1			1								1	1	1	1				
Nebraska NE	1		1		1								1		1		1		1				
New Hampshire NH	1		1		1														1				
New Jersey NJ	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1			1		1			1						
New Mexico NM					1										1								
Nevada NV	1				1								1		1								
New York NY		1				1								1									
Ohio OH	1	1											1					1					
Oklahoma OK				1		1								1				1				1	Other=Corp for Natl & Comm Serv
Oregon OR		1		1	1	1							1			1		1					
Pennsylvania PA	1		1		1		1						1										
Rhode Island RI	1				1								1		1								
South Carolina SC		1				1										1		1					
South Dakota SD	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1				1	1			
Tennessee TN	1	1	1	1	1	1																	
Texas TX	1	1				1											1					1	Other = TX Libr Assn
Utah UT	0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		
Vermont VT		1				1										1		1				1	Other=Publishers
Virginia VA		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0	LVA has worked w/many of these
Washington WA		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0			/orgs in past
West Virginia WV	1	1	1		1	1	1		1		1		1	1	1		1		1				
Wisconsin WI	1	1			1	1									1	1	1	1					
Wyoming WY		1				1								1				1					
Q1Totals	28		14		28		10		6		7		16		19		19		11		2		
Q1 % (of 35)	*80*		*40*		*80*		*29*		*17*		*20*		*46*		*54*		*54*		*31*		*6*		
Q2 Totals		26		13		26		8		4		5		14		14		19		5		4	
Q2 % (of 44)		*59*		*30*		*59*		*18*		*9*		*11*		*32*		*32*		*43*		*11*		*9*	

Notes:

(1) If responses indicated "information only" contacts with above sources (e.g. newsletters, etc.), it was not considered an "ongoing working" relationship. Such responses are not included in the above tally.

(2) Zeros in the above table indicate that the state DID respond to the question, but specifically said "no" to each named organization.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

With which of the following national organizations does the SLRC maintain ongoing working relations to plan for and otherwise advance adult literacy? P6(3)

			US	US	US		CAL	Natl	LVA				US			
	ALA	NIFL	Ed	Labor	HHS	NCAL	ESL	ClorL	Laub	NCLIS	C/B	NGA	Cong	Bus	Other	
Alabama AL		1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1				1		
Alaska AK		1	1	1	1	1	1		1					1		
Arkansas AR																
Arizona AZ		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1			1	1	1		
California CA	1	1	1			1			1		1			1		
Colorado CO		1	1			1	1		1					1	1	Other=NCtrFamLit,NCoalitnHomeless
Connecticut CT		1														
DC																
Delaware DE			1			1	1		1							
Florida FL		1	1			1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1		
Georgia GA																
Hawaii HI		1	1			1									1	Other=NCtrFamLit
Iowa IA		1	1			1	1		1							
Idaho ID																
Illinois IL	1	1	1	1	1	1			1	1	1	1				
Indiana IN	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Kansas KS		1	1													
Kentucky KY	1	1	1			1	1	1	1	1				1		
Louisiana LA		1	1	1		1			1			1	1	1		
Massachusetts MA																
Maryland MD		1	1			1	1	1	1		1					
Maine ME																
Michigan MI		1	1			1		1				1	1	1		
Minnesota MN		1	1			1	1							1		
Missouri MO		1	1			1	1	1	1						1	Other=NCtrFamLit
Mississippi MS		1	1	1	1				1			1	1	1		
Montana MT			1													
North Carolina NC		1	1			1			1			1				
North Dakota ND		1	1	1									1	1		
Nebraska NE		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1			1	1	1		
New Hampshire NH		1	1			1										
New Jersey NJ		1	1	1		1	1	1	1			1		1		
New Mexico NM		1	1	1		1	1	1	1			1		1		
Nevada NV																
New York NY		1	1			1			1			1				
Ohio OH		1	1			1	1	1	1				1			
Oklahoma OK		1	1			1			1				1	1		
Oregon OR																
Pennsylvania PA		1	1			1			1							
Rhode Island RI																
South Carolina SC		1	1			1			1							
South Dakota SD	1	1	1			1	1	1	1					1		
Tennessee TN		1	1						1							
Texas TX																
Utah UT		1	1	1		1	1	1						1		Bus=many, about 150 cos
Vermont VT		1	1			1										
Virginia VA		1	1			1	1		1					1		
Washington WA		1	1			1	1									
West Virginia WV		1	1		1	1			1							
Wisconsin WI		1	1			1	1		1							
Wyoming WY																
Totals	4	37	38	11	7	33	20	12	28	4	4	10	9	19	3	
% (of 40)	*10*	*93*	*95*	*28*	*18*	*83*	*50*	*30*	*70*	*10*	*10*	*25*	*23*	*48*	*8*	

Key:

ALA = American Library Association

NIFL = National Institute for Literacy

USEd = U.S. Department of Education

USLabor = U.S. Department of Labor

USHHS = U.S. Department of Health & Human Services

NCAL = National Center for Adult Literacy

CAL/ESL = Center for Applied Linguistics' Clearinghouse for Adult Literacy ESL Education

Natl ClorL = National Coalition for Literacy

LVA Laub = Literacy Volunteers of America, Laubach

NCLIS = National Commission on Libraries & Information Science

C/B = Center for the Book of The Library of Congress

NGA = National Governors' Association

US Cong = U.S. Congress

Bus = Business Community

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

In a sentence or two, what kind of national-level help not now being provided would the state library agency like to have? (Q1, Q2)

P6a
(1)

State Librarians

Delaware DE	Grants to local libraries or state library agencies for literacy programming.
Indiana IN	We need greater coordination of programs and efforts from the various national level organizations. Our resources are too limited to pick and choose who and what we can support.
Ohio OH	Over the years different staff have had the responsibility to work with literacy. An ALA-sponsored training program in the late 70's was attended by our staff. Staff have also written documents on literacy which have been distributed not only in state but made available to requesters across the nation. Not sure what is available from all the organizations.
Oregon OR	We are satisfied with our contacts at the national level.

In a sentence or two, what kind of national-level help not now being provided would the state library agency like to have? (Q1, Q2)

P6a
(2)

State Library Literacy Contacts

Delaware DE	More assistance in developing and promoting information on literacy programs.
Illinois IL	It would make life much simpler if at least some of these national organizations could adopt this collaborative approach and future planning mechanism (i.e. decide jointly what they can offer to state and local programs after input from programs and then delegate functions so there's less duplication and their services get to programs).
Ohio OH	Over the years different staff have had the responsibility to work with literacy. An ALA sponsored training program in the late 70's was attended by our staff. Staff have also written documents on literacy which have been distributed not only in state but made available to requesters across the nation. Not sure what is available from all agencies. (Identical to Q1)
Oklahoma OK	National awareness and promotion of volunteer & library-based literacy programs is needed.
Texas TX	Funding and/or materials.

What is the SLRC's specific role in statewide planning, policy, and resource development?

P7
(3)

Alabama AL	Assist the State Advisory Council and State Adult Education Office with planning, implementing/clarifying policies and procedures in addition to developing resources for locals, education, & private agencies.
Alaska AK	Coordination and execution.
Arizona AZ	Support adult education and literacy providers in the state by fostering innovation in programs and staff development, research, and evaluation. Provide a resource and technology center accessible to all, improve networking systems among providers, provide coordinated and innovative marketing, deliver benefits of technology to adult ed programs at local level, provide informative publications, develop financial resources.
California CA	Provide resource libraries and staff development for all literacy providers.
Colorado CO	SLRC staff participate when appropriate on statewide task forces, committees, etc. Generally it is under the aegis of the Office of Adult Education, and just incidentally as SLRC staff.
Connecticut CT	Does not have a role on the state level for planning. We are working on developing our resources to be shared on a state level.
Delaware DE	Technical assistance.
Florida FL	Until its closing, it provided research services which informed statewide planning, policy, and resource development.
Hawaii HI	A member of the council.
Iowa IA	Acquisition of materials. Distribution of materials. Support agency for ABE staff development. Promote new adult readers.
Illinois IL	It coordinates statewide planning and resource development across agencies. These activities are accomplished through a technical assistance committee composed of key stakeholders in staff development and a provider advisory group of 17 local programs representing various types of agencies delivering literacy services. It has made strides in blending policy across agencies and is currently pooling resources to fund train-the-trainer projects to benefit all types of literacy service delivery systems.

Indiana IN	Serves as support element to those agencies doing independent planning, p (sic), and development. Support = provides circulating library to field--i.e. tech prep.
Kansas KS	N.R.
Kentucky KY	A special project administered by the SLRC has enabled an interagency policy team to define policy and program outcomes for adult education in Kentucky. The performance measurement initiative is being piloted this year to incorporate record keeping and check benchmarks. The Kentucky Adult Literacy Survey results will be available to policy makers early 1996. Other research and dissemination projects assist in statewide planning and leverage resources.
Louisiana LA	Point of coordination and leadership for all state departments receiving federal literacy/job training funds AND the private sector literacy/job training initiatives.
Maryland MD	The Center is responsible for statewide professional staff development and technical assistance to the adult education and literacy provider network. This includes resource development.
Michigan MI	Coordinating resources and planning--providing assessment and evaluation data for long range planning. We do a lot of public policy work directly with our Congressional delegation.
Minnesota MN	Currently, we are seen more as a support mechanism to planning, policy, and resource development, rather than actively setting policy, etc. I am currently working to change that. The Literacy Training Network has a stronger role as they existed for some 15 years before the SLRCs came along. The Training Network provides leadership in staff development areas and to a lesser extent in learner services.
Missouri MO	The SLRC is responsible for bringing state library, DESE, DFS, JTPA together to develop policy for state. SLRC is a nonprofit and develops resources for all programs it works with and operating expenses.
Mississippi MS	4 functions: coordination, policy, resource center as defined by National Literacy Act, identify and help to disseminate resources for literacy.
Montana MT	Focal point for statewide coordination activities, at least in theory.
North Carolina NC	As part of the Workforce Commission, NCLRC is involved in a full range of workforce development, welfare reform, and education planning and policy. We have initiated a number of collaborations: family literacy --public and private education and social services agencies are developing plans for coordinated service delivery; consistent delivery of staff development and training in cooperation with community colleges, voluntary groups, and CBO's; NIFL system reform initiative grant to develop content standards and performance assessment for literacy.

North Dakota ND	Staff development, dissemination of materials, providing technical assistance to local programs, and conducting in-service for specialized needs.
Nebraska NE	(1) Provide research and development reports, based on our work. (2) Make recommendations to the state department concerning planning, policy, and resource development. (3) Advise the Governor's Policy Research Office about adult literacy related initiatives.
New Hampshire NH	The SLRC was represented on the staff development committee and conference planning activities.
New Jersey NJ	The SLRC's role is largely facilitative.
New Mexico NM	The Coalition's Board develops a 3-year strategic plan to expand and enhance literacy services in the state including expansion of the material loans and training and technical assistance provided out of the SLRC.
New York NY	The SLRC is not directly involved in the statewide planning except in the area of staff development and research.
Ohio OH	Works with all adult literacy programs in the state, Ohio Department of Education, and Governor's Human Resource Investment Council.
Oklahoma OK	Resource staff sit with the State Literacy coordinator on project planning.
Pennsylvania PA	The SLRC coordinates the delivery of resources and information for adult basic and literacy education in partnership with the PA Department of Education, Bureau of Adult Basic and Literacy Education, the staff development centers across the state, and local literacy programs.
South Carolina SC	Statewide planning for all staff development. Key player in standards and measures for program quality. Technical assistance provider to all state Even Start programs. Curriculum development for ABE/Workplace.
South Dakota SD	The Center's specific mission is to provide access to existing literacy materials through an online catalog and to purchase needed materials and assist with providing training. These services are provided to ABE, Career Learning Centers, and local literacy councils.
Tennessee TN	The SLRC Advisory Committee has remained active this year despite cuts in federal funding for CLS's Resource Center. This statewide advisory group is composed of representatives from [various organizations/entities around the state]. As the TN Literacy Resource Center, CLS has developed an interagency performance reporting and improvement system (TRIMS), under a grant from the National Institute for Literacy. In this way, CLS and the TRIMS Policy Team are very involved in statewide planning and policy efforts.

Utah UT	Assess needs. Recommend direction changes, acquisitions, etc.
Vermont VT	The SLRC director serves as the director of the Vermont Literacy Board, so activities overlap. The VLB is responsible for statewide planning, policy, and resource development.
Virginia VA	1. Support the state's adult learning system by providing services and resources for all engaged in literacy and adult education. 2. Dissemination. 3. Coordination and collaboration. 4. Materials/clearinghouse--library function statewide circulation of materials. 5. Communications link. 6. Literacy hotline and referral.
Washington WA	Virtually none.
Wisconsin WI	Supportive role: conduct needs assessments, provide professional development workshops, disseminate information, conduct research, literature surveys, etc.
West Virginia WV	The director [of the WV Center for Adult Literacy and Learning] regularly meets with the ABE directors at the State Department of Education and the WV Literacy Council to plan for the future. The primary function of WV-CALL has been in training for adult literacy providers.

Please indicate the SLRC's current annual budget.			P7a
If SLRC is not free-standing please give name of organization it			P8
is technically part of (e.g. state dept of ed, state coalition).			(3 only)

	Budget		Name of parent organization
Alabama AL	158,269		State Department of Education
Alaska AK	1,000,000		Nine Star Enterprises, Inc., a 501(c) literacy organization
Arkansas AR			
Arizona AZ	327,866		A nonprofit organization
California CA	870,000	Plus $80,000 in-kind staff	
Colorado CO	?	Varies	CO Department of Education, Office of Adult Education
Connecticut CT	62,000		Adult Training & Development Network, Capitol Regn Ed Council
DC			
Delaware DE	25,000		DE Assn for Ad & Community Ed
Florida FL	0	SLRC closed 7/95, no $	Was part of Florida State University
Georgia GA			
Hawaii HI	187,575	Payroll & supplies	Hawaii's State Public Library System
Iowa IA	74,000		Northeast Iowa Regional Library System
Idaho ID			
Illinois IL	327,000	Enough to go to 12/96	Sec. of State Literacy Office, IL State Library
Indiana IN	130,000		Indiana Literacy Foundation, Inc. as of 7/95; some new State Library admin
Kansas KS	82,000		State Department of Education
Kentucky KY	90,500		KY Dept for Adult Ed, & Literacy, Cabinet for Wkforce Dev
Louisiana LA	153,907		Gov's Office of Lifelong Learning
Massachusetts MA			
Maryland MD	75,722		State Dept. of Ed
Maine ME			
Michigan MI	180,000		State Dept. of Ed
Minnesota MN	35,000		Part of Literacy Training Network, which has own budget
Missouri MO	900,000		
Mississippi MS	389,000		Institutions of higher learning
Montana MT	37,842		
North Carolina NC	N.R.		353 proj .Training Inst. @ Appalachian St. Univ., Part of Gov's Wkforce Comm
North Dakota ND	24,000		State Dept. of Ed
Nebraska NE	38,000		Dept of Voc & Adult Ed, Univ of Nebraska
New Hampshire NH	35,370	Last budget; Ctr dissolved	Was part of Nashua Adult Learning Center
New Jersey NJ	224,642		NJ Dept of Ed, State Employment & Trainng Commission
New Mexico NM	120,000		Administered by the NM Coalition for Literacy
Nevada NV			
New York NY	898,278	Terminated 12/31/95	School of Ed, SUNY Albany
Ohio OH	304,000		Kent State University
Oklahoma OK	100,262		State Department of Libraries
Oregon OR			
Pennsylvania PA	0	Using leftover 94-95 $	State Dept of Ed
Rhode Island RI			
South Carolina SC	90,000	Was over 200,000	State Dept of Ed
South Dakota SD	25,000		SD State Library, of Dept. of Ed
Tennessee TN	0	For 1995-96	University of Tennessee
Texas TX			
Utah UT	127,556		State Dept of Ed
Vermont VT	0		VT State Dept of Ed, VT Literacy Bd
Virginia VA	292,362	For FY 95-96	
Washington WA	131,000	For 7/95-6/96	Grant funds come via Seattle Central Community College
West Virginia WV	76,369	FY94, -0- FY95 except carryover	State Dept. of Education
Wisconsin WI	92,000		Wisconsin Technical College System Board
Wyoming WY			
	$7,684,520		

SDE = 14
State or Regl Library = 5
Colleges/Universities = 8
Other Organizations = 8

SLRCs w/in Library: HI, IA, IL, OK, SD

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Please check any of the following specific services that your SLRC provides to literacy planning, policy development, & funding groups in the state:

P9 (3)

	State Advocacy	Nat'l Advocacy	Policy Dev & Planning	Statewide Conferencg	Prof Staff Developmt	Eval. Pgm Dev. Other Tech Asst	Data Collct & Analysis	Lending Library Resources	Other	
Alabama AL	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		
Alaska AK			1	1	1	1	1	1	1	Statewide coordination
Arkansas AR										
Arizona AZ	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	Family workplace/force lit via consultants
California CA	1		1	1	1			1		
Colorado CO					1			1		
Connecticut CT	1		1		1	1		1		
DC										
Delaware DE	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		
Florida FL			1	1	1	1	1	1	1	Online conferencing & research
Georgia GA										
Hawaii HI	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	PMRIS
Iowa IA	1	1	1	1	1		1	1		
Idaho ID										
Illinois IL	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		
Indiana IN				1				1		
Kansas KS				1	1			1		
Kentucky KY	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	Research
Louisiana LA	1		1	1	1	1	1	1		
Massachusetts MA										
Maryland MD				1	1	1	1	1		
Maine ME										
Michigan MI	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		
Minnesota MN			1		1			1		
Missouri MO		1	1	1	1	1	1	1		
Mississippi MS	1	1	1		1	1	1	1		
Montana MT	1			1			1			
North Carolina NC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		Only through assn w/Workforce Comm
North Dakota ND	1		1	1	1	1	1	1		
Nebraska NE	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	Communication "hub"
New Hampshire NH	1	1		1	1	1				Used to provide
New Jersey NJ				1	1	1		1	1	Agency coordination
New Mexico NM	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		
Nevada NV										
New York NY	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		
Ohio OH		1			1	1	1	1		
Oklahoma OK	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		
Oregon OR										
Pennsylvania PA			1	1	1	1		1		
Rhode Island RI										
South Carolina SC	1			1	1	1	1	1	1	Workplace assessment
South Dakota SD	1	1	1	1	1			1		
Tennessee TN	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		
Texas TX										
Utah UT	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	GED on TV, GED Testng Admin,
Vermont VT	1	1	1	1	1			1		Research & Dissemination
Virginia VA	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	Technology dev/electronic linkage
Washington WA						1		1		On regional basis
West Virginia WV	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		
Wisconsin WI	1			1	1	1	1	1		
Wyoming WY										
Totals	27	22	28	33	36	30	26	37	10	
% (of 40)	*66*	*55*	*70*	*83*	*90*	*75*	*65*	*93*	*25*	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Please check any of the following services that the SLRC provides directly to local literacy programs (regardless of their institutional base).

P9a (3)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16		
																		1 State advocacy
Alabama AL	1		1	1	1	1	1	1			1		1					2 National advocacy
Alaska AK			1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1			3 Public awareness
Arkansas AR																		4 Policy development & planning
Arizona AZ	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1				5 Statewide conferencing
California CA	1		1		1	1		1				1	1	1	1			6 Professional staff development
Colorado CO	1		1			1	1	1		1	1			1				7 Program development
Connecticut CT	1			1		1	1	1	1		1	1		1				8 Curriculum development
DC																		9 Evaluation/assessment
Delaware DE	1	1		1		1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1				10 Training tutors or tutor trainers
Florida FL			1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1		1	O=Online database searches	11 Applying research to practice
Georgia GA																		12 Fundraising/resource dev.
Hawaii HI			1	1	1	1			1			1	1	1	1	1	O=FamLitTraining	13 Data collection & analysis
Iowa IA			1		1	1	1	1						1				14 Lending library resources
Idaho ID																		15 Grant funds
Illinois IL	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		16 Other
Indiana IN					1									1				
Kansas KS					1			1		1				1				
Kentucky KY	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1			
Louisiana LA	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1				
Massachusetts MA																		
Maryland MD			1		1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1			
Maine ME																		
Michigan MI	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1		1	1	1			
Minnesota MN						1						1		1			Note Advocacy areas will expand	
Missouri MO			1	1	1	1	1	1		1		1		1	1		when we get a WWW server &	
Mississippi MS	1	1	1	1		1	1		1	1		1	1	1			site in place	
Montana MT			1		1								1					
North Carolina NC			1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1				
North Dakota ND			1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1			
Nebraska NE	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1			
New Hampshire NH	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1					1			
New Jersey NJ					1	1	1	1	1				1	1				
New Mexico NM	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1		1	1	1				
Nevada NV																		
New York NY	1	1	1		1	1	1	1		1	1			1				
Ohio OH	1	1				1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1			
Oklahoma OK	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	O=Dev statistics for grant	
Oregon OR															1		writing & cooperative pgming	
Pennsylvania PA		1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1			1					
Rhode Island RI																		
South Carolina SC	1		1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1				
South Dakota SD	1	1		1	1	1		1	1					1	1			
Tennessee TN	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1				
Texas TX																		
Utah UT	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	O=GED on TV, GED	
Vermont VT	1	1	1	1	1	1						1		1	1		Testing Admin	
Virginia VA	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1			1		1		1	O=Recruitment via hotline & referral	
Washington WA		1	1											1		1	All svcs regl. O=Prom/use instr tech	
West Virginia WV	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1			
Wisconsin WI	1	1	1	1	1	1		1		1			1	1	1			
Wyoming WY																		
Totals	25	21	31	25	32	36	29	30	27	24	22	21	26	36	18	7		
% (of 40)	*63*	*53*	*78*	*63*	*80*	*90*	*73*	*75*	*68*	*60*	*55*	*53*	*65*	*90*	*45*	*18*		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CONTENTS
4. Finance

F1 Does your state library agency currently provide adult literacy funding to the state's central and branch library facilities? [Adult literacy in this study refers to basic reading, writing, and math programs for adults in various contexts. It includes both workplace/workforce literacy and family literacy. Note that in family literacy programs, the focus of instruction is on parents.] (Q1, Q2)

F2 If federal funding for **library literacy programs** were substantially cut, which of the following do you think would occur: Library-based adult literacy programs in your state would have to reduce their level of service and outreach...most would be able to find replacement funding...many would be unable to survive...they would not be significantly affected...other impacts. (Q1, Q2, Q3, Q4)

F2a If federal funding for **adult literacy programming in general** were cut substantially, which of the following do you think would occur: Most programs would have to reduce their level of service and outreach, most would be able to find replacement funding, many would be unable to survive, most would not be significantly affected, other impacts. (Q3)

F3 Federal support for literacy will likely be provided through state block grants starting in the fall of 1996. How do you think this dramatic shift will affect your agency's capacity to provide leadership in library literacy (e.g. will it affect the level of funding available from your agency, will shared decision-making among local libraries and your agency be increased or decreased)? (Q1, Q2)

F3a Most federal support for literacy will likely be provided through state block grants stating in the fall of 1996. How do you think this dramatic shift will affect the adult literacy situation in your state from the standpoint of funding, policy development and planning, and service provision? (Q3, Q4))

F4 Some library literacy personnel are worried that the block grant approach will place libraries at a disadvantage in competing for available state education/literacy funds. What difficulties will you, your organization, or others involved in the provision of library literacy services face if the majority of literacy funding does come in block grant form? (Q1, Q2, Q3, Q4)

F4a What can national and state leadership organizations do to help you and other literacy/library groups in your state minimize or protect against anticipated problems from the block grant approach? (Q1, Q2, Q3, Q4)

F5 As best you can determine, what is the total amount of your state's fiscal 1995 funding for adult literacy programs, including workplace/workforce literacy, family literacy, basic ESL, ABE, and voluntary programs? (Or give the amount for the latest year available and specify year) (Q3 only)

F5a As best you can tell, what percent of this state funding goes to local library literacy programs? (Q3)

F6
F6a In the past 5 years has your state's funding of adult literacy programs increased, decreased, or stayed about the same: F6: As a percentage of the total state budget? F6a: In dollar amount of support? (Q3)

F7 As best you can determine, what % of the state's adult literacy funding for FY95 comes from the sources listed below (or use latest year available as reported in F5a). (Q3)

F8 Does the SLRC currently have a major role in directing or facilitating the flow of adult literacy funding to the state's local literacy programs, including those based in public libraries? If yes, what form does this role take and with what other key groups is the responsibility shared? (Q3)

Does your state library agency currently provide adult literacy funding to the state's central and branch public library facilities?

F1
(1,2)

Note: Adult literacy in this study refers to basic reading, writing, and math programs for adults in various contexts.
It includes ESL, workplace/workforce literacy, & family literacy. In family literacy programs, the focus of instruction is on parents.

	Q1			Q2			
	Yes	No	No R	Yes	No	No R	
Alabama AL		1					
Alaska AK				1			
Arkansas AR		1		1			
Arizona AZ							
California CA				1			
Colorado CO				1			Q2=Minimal & only w/LSCA funds
Connecticut CT				1			Q2=Through LVA CT
DC	1						
Delaware DE		1			1		
Florida FL	1			1			Q1=federal $; local librs may use state aid at their election for such pgms.
Georgia GA	1			1			
Hawaii HI		1		1			Q2=Funding to a small staff for coordination, study & meetings.
Iowa IA		1			1		
Idaho ID		1			1		
Illinois IL	1			1			Q1=LSCA in past
Indiana IN	1			1			
Kansas KS	1				1		
Kentucky KY		1			1		
Louisiana LA					1		
Massachusetts MA					1		
Maryland MD	1				1		
Maine ME	1					1	
Michigan MI	1					1	Q1=LSCA grants
Minnesota MN		1		1			Q2=Yes, federal LSCA
Missouri MO	1			1			Q1=Through LSCA Titles I & VI. Q2=competitive grants
Mississippi MS				1			Q2=Through LSCA Titles I and VI.
Montana MT		1			1		
North Carolina NC							
North Dakota ND		1			1		
Nebraska NE		1				1	
New Hampshire NH		1				1	
New Jersey NJ			1	1			
New Mexico NM		1		1			Q2=[Through our] pgm of "target population grants".
Nevada NV		1					
New York NY				1			Q2=Through grants
Ohio OH	1			1			
Oklahoma OK				1			
Oregon OR		1		1			Q2=LSCA competitive grants. State aid focus on improving children's library services
Pennsylvania PA		1				1	
Rhode Island RI		1					
South Carolina SC				1			Q2=LSCA
South Dakota SD		1			1		
Tennessee TN	1			1			Q1=We've assumed role of support agency to assist local adult ed pgms.
Texas TX	1			1			Q2=Through the funds given to the 10 library systems.
Utah UT	1						
Vermont VT					1		
Virginia VA					1		
Washington WA				1			Q2=Federal funds on basis of merits of proposals.
West Virginia WV		1			1		
Wisconsin WI	1			1			Q1/Q2=if federal
Wyoming WY					1		
	15	19	1	24	15	5	
Q1 % (of 34)	*44*	*56*					
Q2 % (of 39)				*62*	*38*		

If federal funding for library literacy programs were substantially cut, which of the following do you think would occur?

F2 (1-4)

Note: In Q4, ref is to "your" program, and to federal funding cuts for adult lit in general but libr lit programs in particular.

1 - Most libr lit pgms would have to reduce their level of outreach/service.

	Q1					Q2					Q3					Q4						
																					2 - Most would be able to find replacement funding.	
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	2	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	3 - Many would be unable to survive	
Alabama AL	1		1								1					1					4 - They/most would not be significantly affected.	
Alaska AK								1			0	0	0	0	0						5 - Other impacts (please specify)	
Arkansas AR	1		1			1		1								2		1				
Arizona AZ											1	1	1									
California CA						1					1					4		1	1	1	Q3=many, not most because of state funding	Q4=5. block grants/other $ needed
Colorado CO						1					1		1			1		1			Q4=3,might not be able to survive	
Connecticut CT						1					1					1		1			Q4=3,might not be able to survive	
DC	1																					
Delaware DE	1		1					1					1			2				1	Q4=5,lose staff, reduce volunteer trng pgm	
Florida FL				1			1		1				1			4	1		2	2	Q4=5,less local govt support, frustrated volunteers, shift in library priorities	
Georgia GA	1			1		1			1							3						
Hawaii HI	1						1		1		0	0	0	0	0							
Iowa IA	1		1			1					1											
Idaho ID				1		1				1											Q2=Would limit dev of new pgms	
Illinois IL	1					1		1					1			3	1			1	Q2=3,if not in partnership w/ed component.	Q4=5,reduce from cnty to local svc
Indiana IN	1		1			1					1					2	1	1	1	1	Q1=3, some not many	Q4=5,50% less staff, collection losses
Kansas KS	1					1		1	1		0	0	0	0	0	1		1		1	Q4=5, eliminate all outreach sites	
Kentucky KY	1		1			1		1			1		1									
Louisiana LA						1					1		1									
Massachusetts MA						1		1								2		2	1		Q2=3,many would survive with difficulty	
Maryland MD				1		1		1					1						1		Q2=3, or survive with difficulty	
Maine ME	1		1			0	0	0	0	0												
Michigan MI	1		1		1	0	0	0	0	0	1		1			1		1			Q4=3,probably wouldn't survive	
Minnesota MN	1					0	0	0	0	0			1			2	1	2				
Missouri MO						1		1					1									
Mississippi MS	1		1			1		1			1	1										
Montana MT	1		1			1		1					1									
North Carolina NC											1		1			1						
North Dakota ND				1				1					1									
Nebraska NE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1					1						
New Hampshire NH	1		1			0	0	0	0	0			1									
New Jersey NJ	1					1		1			1		1			2	1			2	Q4=5,fewer tutors will mean fewer learners: some pgms would be phased out	
New Mexico NM	1					1	1	1			1					1					Q2=1,2 some, not most	
Nevada NV	1		1																			
New York NY						1					1					2	1		2		Q4=4,funded 2 more yrs private $; after that out there with the rest.	
Ohio OH	1		1			1		1						1								
Oklahoma OK							1			1	1		1			2	1		1		Q2=5, State-level support (e.g. scholarships, grants, state	
Oregon OR	1		1			1			1							1					Q2=4, because most locally funded	conferencing) would be
Pennsylvania PA				1		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1			1	1	Q4=5,Pgm would keep to routine, do little new	reduced/eliminated
Rhode Island RI	1		1													1						
South Carolina SC						1		1			1					1						
South Dakota SD			1					1			1											
Tennessee TN	1		1						1	1	0	0	0	0	0						Q2=5, strong collections will become outdated in 5-6 yrs	
Texas TX	1		1			1		1								5		2				
Utah UT	1	1	1								1						1			1	Q1=Some in 2&3, not many/most	Q4=5,loss of pgm staff to fundraising
Vermont VT									1		1											
Virginia VA						0	0	0	0	0	1				1			1			Q3=5,deletion of programs	
Washington WA						1					0	0	0	0	0	1			1	1	Q4=5,less natl advocacy, reduce state emphasis	
West Virginia WV	1		1			1					1		1			1		1				
Wisconsin WI	1	1				1	1				0	0	0	0	0					1	Q4=5,space would cost $8000 yr, more time fundraising	
Wyoming WY						1																
	28	2	20	6	1	28	5	18	7	3	23	2	18	1	0	49	8	15	11	13		
%	*80*	*6*	*57*	*11*	*3*	*64*	*11*	*41*	*16*	*7*	*58*	*5*	*45*	*3*	*0*	*78*	*13*	*24*	*18*	*21*		

Note:	rs	frf	mus	nsa	oth
Total Q1-4 (182)	128	17	71	26	17
% Comb Totals	*70*	*9*	*39*	*14*	*9*

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

If federal funding for adult literacy programming in general were cut substantially which of the following do you think would occur?

F2a (3)

1 - Most programs would have to reduce their level of service and outreach.
2 - Most would be able to find replacement funding.
3 - Many would be unable to survive.
4 - Most would not be significantly affected.
5 - Other impacts (please specify)

	Q3					
	1	2	3	4	5	
Alabama AL	1					
Alaska AK	1		1			
Arkansas AR						
Arizona AZ	1		1			
California CA	1		1			
Colorado CO	1		1			
Connecticut CT	1		1			
DC						
Delaware DE	1		1			
Florida FL	1		1			
Georgia GA						
Hawaii HI	1					
Iowa IA	1					
Idaho ID						
Illinois IL	1					
Indiana IN	1		1			
Kansas KS	1		1			
Kentucky KY	1				1	5=Reduced emphasis on program quality, e.g. staff dev
Louisiana LA			1			
Massachusetts MA						
Maryland MD	1				1	5=Small programs with 1 administrator and 2-3 teachers
Maine ME						/serving less than 100 people wouldn't survive.
Michigan MI	1		1			
Minnesota MN	1					
Missouri MO	1					
Mississippi MS	1		1			
Montana MT	1		1			
North Carolina NC	1		1			
North Dakota ND			1			
Nebraska NE	1		1		1	5=Would result in severe reductions in service & staff dev.
New Hampshire NH	1					
New Jersey NJ	1		1			
New Mexico NM	1	1				
Nevada NV						
New York NY	1		1			
Ohio OH	1					
Oklahoma OK	1		1			
Oregon OR						
Pennsylvania PA						N.R.
Rhode Island RI						
South Carolina SC	1		1			
South Dakota SD	1					
Tennessee TN	1		1			
Texas TX						
Utah UT	1					
Vermont VT	1					
Virginia VA	1		1			
Washington WA	1				1	5=Some CBOs would cease to exist or offer lit instruction.
West Virginia WV	1		1			
Wisconsin WI	1					
Wyoming WY						
	37	1	23	0	4	
% (of 39 responds)	*95*	*3*	*59*	*3*	*10*	

Federal support for literacy will likely be provided through state block grants starting in the fall of 1996. How do you think this dramatic shift will affect your agency's capacity to provide leadership in library literacy (e.g. will it affect the level of funding available from your agency, will shared decision-making among local libraries and your agency be increased or decreased)?

F3
(1)

State Librarians

Alabama AL	Few Alabama public libraries are directly involved in administering and conducting adult literacy programs. I believe there will be minimum impact.
Arkansas AR	We are not anticipating any change. Block grants may affect the level of funding, but we have never been able to use a significant portion of LSCA funds for literacy due to other pressing needs expressed by public libraries. Decision-making on mutual concerns has always been a shared activity among libraries and the State Library and likely will not change at all.
DC	Because the situation is essentially unknown, we do have concerns as to whether or not our needs will be met as they were previously.
Delaware DE	Depends on what state agency/office controls the block grant.
Florida FL	It will not have much of an effect.
Georgia GA	It will probably not have a major impact because most federal literacy funding goes to the Georgia Department of Technical and Adult Education. Public Library Services has limited interaction with this agency but does serve on their interagency council. Our activities have used LSCA funds and literacy will remain an eligible activity. Funding levels will be dependent upon the new state plan.
Hawaii HI	Hawaii State Public Library System will probably be designated by the governor to be the recipient of the state block grant.
Iowa IA	Given the structure of Iowa's literacy program, no major impact is anticipated except with the Literacy Resource Center.
Idaho ID	We would not anticipate being a recipient of any funds distributed through block grants and as such probably would not be an active participant in such activities.
Illinois IL	Funds will go to the state education agency and funds for libraries will be non-existent. Public libraries will be hurt significantly and it will undercut their expansion into community learning efforts. Libraries will lose visibility opportunities but still be expected to continue working with literacy efforts without funding or real input.
Indiana IN	If the block grant includes State Library administration we should see little change. If block goes to workforce development that has seen substantial cuts in other funding, there will be a substantial reduction in volunteer, basic literacy programs to workforce/employment. While we traditionally work with local library input, D.W.D. does not.

Kansas KS	The funding will go to classroom adult education rather than to one-on-one, library-supported programs.
Kentucky KY	[Shared] decision-making [among local libraries and the State Library] will be increased.
Maryland MD	It will not impact.
Maine ME	We will continue to sponsor workshops that help librarians learn more about addressing the issues of illiteracy. We will also continue to assist librarians develop grants and plan programs in partnership with other agencies/literacy providers.
Michigan MI	Our experience in the past was that by coordinating with the Governor's staff, a share of federal literacy funding was allocated to assist volunteer literacy training programs, in cooperation with local public libraries. We hope that a similar arrangement can be developed once the new pattern of block grant funding has been established. We would probably continue to work through our foundation to support adult literacy programs, since staff is not available to operate a centralized program from the Library of Michigan.
Minnesota MN	Now we have encouraged libraries to apply to USDE for LSCA literacy grants. We received one of these ourselves which supported community coalition building and publication of our book Library Resources for Literacy. A block grant approach will likely take more staff time in competing for resources.
Mississippi MS	The agency has taken advantage of LSCA program funds to supplement literacy efforts on the local and state level. Until we see what state block grants will involve, we cannot make a detailed assessment of this situation.
Montana MT	Currently we are the state's literacy resource center. However, we are working to produce an RFP to allow other entities to "bid" to be our state's LRC. We do not have the resources sufficient to commit to this activity to do it well.
North Dakota ND	N.R.
Nebraska NE	No change.
New Hampshire NH	The state library will continue to provide statewide coordination and technical support to local libraries.
New Jersey NJ	Everything depends on the amount of money in the block grant.
New Mexico NM	N.R.
Nevada NV	We have a strong position with the Governor.

Ohio OH	Block grants would not necessarily be directed to literacy in the amounts of support that are desperately needed. Focus on technology will be the major thrust. We will need to educate the library community to insure that literacy is an area in which the technology can be facilitated. At the present time the State library has not made a final decision on how the funds will be allocated.
Oregon OR	We have made and will continue to make grants of federal funds (LSCA/LSTA) for demonstration projects. We will not be able to provide ongoing program support.
Pennsylvania PA	There will be limited impact.
Rhode Island RI	If federal block grant funding comes to the state library agency (as in the proposed LSTA) we will be able to do more than we do now. If it comes through education block grants to the Governor, we will have little or no influence or ability to allocate any funds to library literacy programs.
South Dakota SD	The amount of funding for literacy will depend on the agenda that is set by state and federal legislation. Any funds for literacy at this time would need to be federal dollars.
Tennessee TN	We will have to take an overall view and decide on priorities.
Texas TX	Block grant will likely be administered by the Workforce Commission, a new agency formed by the last session of the legislature from parts of other agencies. It is too soon to know how they will deal with libraries.
Utah UT	Uncertain. It depends on the amount of funding received and the nature/approved uses of the funds appropriated.
Wisconsin WI	I had thought that dollars were being set aside to be administered by the state library agency in the pending block grants? We have been heavily dependent on federal funding to promote literacy. Although we have a good relationship with the Technical College system--the most likely administrator of a state block grant for literacy---I can't imagine that we'll have the same level of funding or the same autonomy in the use of these funds if we must go through them.
West Virginia WV	Whatever funding, we'll attempt to continue as best possible.

Federal support for literacy will likely be provided through state block grants starting in the fall of 1996. How do you think this dramatic shift will affect your agency's capacity to provide leadership in library literacy (e.g. will it affect the level of funding available from your agency, will shared decision-making among local libraries and your agency be increased or decreased)? F3 (2)

State Library Literacy Contacts

Alaska AK	Cutbacks in personnel and general funding have made literacy programming an even lower priority. We will be struggling to maintain basic levels of library service and do not anticipate initiating literacy programs.
Arkansas AR	We are not anticipating any change. Block grants may affect the level of funding, but we have never been able to use a significant portion of LSCA funds for literacy due to other pressing needs expressed by public libraries. Decision-making on mutual concerns has always been a shared activity among libraries and the State Library and likely will not change at all. (Identical to Q1)
California CA	Our primary funding comes from state general funds through categorical adult and family literacy funding under the California Library Services Act. We have amendments to that Act that provide statutory bases for (1) adult and (2) family literacy in public libraries.
Colorado CO	It will probably mean the end of support with federal $ for library literacy in Colorado. Since the existence of our office is at risk, there may be no centralized state official for library literacy. For several years, the state office has encouraged local programs including library literacy to develop the connections, locally and at the state level, that will place them in decision-making groups.
Connecticut CT	It will probably reduce the amount of support we will be able to provide to LVA-CT.
Delaware DE	Literacy programs will have to compete with other needs.
Florida FL	It will not have a significant impact.
Georgia GA	It will probably not have a major impact because most federal funding goes to the Georgia Department of Technical and Adult Education. Public Library Services has limited interaction with this agency but does serve on their interagency council. Our activities have used LSCA funds and literacy will remain an eligible activity. Funding levels will be dependent upon the new state plan. (Identical to Q1)
Hawaii HI	With the recent reorganization, services to support literacy will increase.
Iowa IA	I don't know.
Idaho ID	Not sure.

Illinois IL	Our leadership role in literacy will remain strong. Annually the SOS budget provides for $6 million to fund local community, workplace and family literacy programs. With current joint funding efforts between adult education and the state resource center, we see an increasing occurrence of shared decision making involving libraries. We must however continue our marketing efforts with both libraries and education to ensure their better understanding of the joint benefit to both but more importantly to the common clients--students and patrons.
Indiana IN	Our grants have been through LSCA funds so they may have to be discontinued. Since the State Library is a major player within our state's literacy coalition, I don't see a major shift in leadership capacity.
Kansas KS	The State Library is involved in some decision-making with our state board of education. I believe it will increase somewhat as Education "jockeys" to find support.
Kentucky KY	As written now, it will give us a chance to fine tune programming to state's need.
Louisiana LA	Not much; we expect the LA Department of Education to poorly manage this money. But our advocacy and efforts will likely continue at about the same level.
Massachusetts MA	We will need to re-examine through planning and budget how much to allocate to libraries. Critical decision will be if this is to be "seed money" (which it has always been) or may be used for on-going program support. This will require much more effort on our part.
Maryland MD	Because we are part of a K-12 institution, priorities are toward serving children. Funds for adult target groups will likely decrease.
Michigan MI	N.R.
Minnesota MN	We will continue to pursue our mission to provide leadership in pursuit of excellent library services for all Minnesotans.
Missouri MO	Shared decision-making would be essential to continue provision of library literacy services at current or enhanced levels.
Mississippi MS	At this point the Mississippi Library Commission has used LSCA funds to supplement local literacy efforts. Until we see what state block grants will involve, we cannot make a detailed assessment of this situation. (Nearly identical to Q1)
Montana MT	Currently we are the state's literacy resource center. However, we are working to produce an RFP to allow other entities to "bid" to be our state's LRC. We do not have the resources sufficient to commit to this activity to do it well. (Identical to Q1)
North Dakota ND	Shared decision-making among local libraries and the State agency will be decreased.

Maine ME	N.R.
Nebraska NE	N.R.
New Hampshire NH	N.R.
New Jersey NJ	N.R.
New Mexico NM	We may be able to play a larger role and perhaps be able to increase funds available for literacy activities. I anticipate more dialog between this agency and local libraries.
New York NY	If the funding is not specifically for libraries, other sectors, primarily schools, will receive the funds. Libraries, community based organizations, and community colleges will be fighting for the same reduced funds.
Ohio OH	Block grants would not necessarily be directed to literacy in the amounts of support that are desperately needed. Focus on technology will be the major thrust. We will need to educate the library community to insure that literacy is an area in which the technology can be facilitated. At the present time the State Library has not made a final decision on how the funds will be allocated. (Identical to Q1)
Oklahoma OK	If our agency receives adequate funding, from whatever source, the shift should not affect our capacity to provide library literacy leadership.
Oregon OR	If federal support for adult literacy is provided through state block grants, I believe our ability to provide leadership in library literacy will remain about the same. Because the Adult Basic Education programs of community colleges have the mandate to provide tutoring services, libraries have played the role of information and referral service to providers. The state library would still plan to promote that role for libraries, and it appears that the new federal library program under development may be able to be used for literacy grant projects (to improve services to underserved or disadvantaged persons, not to mention the one-stop job center concept). If the change in federal literacy funding dramatically changes the funding levels of ABE, then I trust the state library would be invited to be involved in statewide planning for literacy with our other partners. Public libraries could not adopt the tutoring role across the board without increases to their resources, and they would look to the state library to carry this message.
Pennsylvania PA	N.R.
South Carolina SC	Minor.
South Dakota SD	The amount of funding for literacy in general will depend on the agenda that will be set by the Governor.
Tennessee TN	There would be a serious lack of support materials and no leadership training capabilities.

Texas TX	The Texas State Library participates in shared decision-making with the 10 Texas Library Systems. The Library Systems then disperse funds and make decisions with the public libraries in each system. With reduced funds, each system will receive less funds for literacy. The decision-making among local libraries and the systems will change in the allocation of the funds.
Vermont VT	All/most of these funds would go to the Department of Education and thus would not be controlled by the Dept. of Libraries. The lack of LSCA Title VI funding would hamper libraries' ability to apply for funds directly for innovative projects.
Virginia VA	N.R.
Washington WA	State block grants for literacy may have a detrimental effect for libraries. Although the State Library has a representative on one of the advisory bodies which might help make the decisions, libraries are not a loud voice when compared to the other players of community colleges, businesses, volunteer groups. The State Library currently gives LSCA Title I money to libraries who write winning grant proposals. Unfortunately, not very many libraries apply. About 5-6 WA libraries have applied for Title VI funds each year. I doubt any specific funds will be designated for literacy since the needs assessment done of library directors and staff states they do not want the State Library to use LSCA for literacy and do not want consulting on literacy and literacy programs.
West Virginia WV	Presently, eight West Virginia Library/Literacy programs are funded with LSCA VI grants. These are nationally competitive. Block grants sound good on the surface, however if the money is through the State Department of Education I fear public libraries will not be able to fairly compete.
Wisconsin WI	I had thought that $s were being set aside to be administered by the state library agency in the pending block grants? (Identical to first sentence of Q1)
Wyoming WY	I assume these block grants would be awarded through State Departments of Education. We, at the State Library, would wish to cooperate and help coordinate efforts.

Federal support for literacy will likely be provided through state block grants starting in the fall of 1996. How do you think this dramatic shift will affect the adult literacy situation in your state from the standpoint of funding, policy development and planning, and service provision?

F3a
(3)

SLRCs

Alaska AK	We're working on it. Don't know yet.
Alabama AL	We will do more networking with local communities.
Arizona AZ	From an article printed in SLRC's newsletter, *Centergram*: "Persons served by adult basic education programs represent the most disconnected political constituency in the U.S. They are typically poor...and by definition educationally disadvantaged. They have little or no access to power and policymaking. They and the marginalized programs that serve their needs cannot compete with the entrenched...powerful interests of K-12, community colleges, and job training systems, which will overwhelm them in the wicked struggle sure to ensue for possession of a reduced pot of block-granted funds. Adult education, if block granted, will get the smallest fraction of the pot--despite the great need documented by the NALS study and by nationwide waiting lists. This is a 'perverse inverse' common to Adult Education. If Adult Education survives the struggle for block grant funds at all, it will in all likelihood have a subordinated, tacked-on role to quota- and competency-driven, time-limited job training programs. This will effectively eliminate the participation of millions." (From testimony given in May 1995 to the Senate Subcommittee on Education, Arts, & the Humanities, by Greg Hart, Director of Pima County Adult Education.)
California CA	Hopefully it will provide the catalyst for cementing the role of the State Collaborative Literacy Council and far more collaborative planning across the board.
Colorado CO	Probably eliminate adult basic skills education in Colorado.
Connecticut CT	We will be less effective in our current programs. It will affect our collaborative efforts with other state agencies such as the Labor Department and Social Services. It will reduce our capabilities of providing or exploring innovative and effective programs.
Delaware DE	May be unable to access funding since there will be no set asides.
Florida FL	This will result in smaller amounts and the risk of poor distribution or misplaced priorities based on influential interest group pressure.
Hawaii HI	N.R.

Iowa IA	If block grant is directed toward State Department of Education, I believe emphasis will stay the same, but dollars may be fewer depending on grant size.
Illinois IL	It appears that literacy funding will be directly tied to getting people off welfare and into work with time limits set and some activities such as literacy tutoring not being eligible to count toward hours of participation in the case of public assistance clients. The lowest level students will not be able to make sufficient progress to meet criteria I'm afraid. While an integration of education with training theoretically sounds good, I'm not certain that funding for adult literacy will have any type of priority.
Indiana IN	Increase division between voluntary literacy programs and adult education sites.
Kansas KS	This depends upon which bill, Goodling's or Kassebaum's, is dominant in the conference committee report. In either case, funding will be cut.
Kentucky KY	Adult literacy and more specifically workforce development and adult training remain a state priority. Therefore, the competition for block grant funds will be less intense. However, with fewer federal dollars coming to the state, the dollars for adult education services will be reduced.
Louisiana LA	Everyone is wondering the same thing. With a new administration coming in, we do not know.
Maryland MD	Policy for adult education/literacy would be influenced by the Governor's initiatives and state goals such as workforce development; thus, funding and services provision would most likely be geared to agencies, organizations, and programs focusing on state goals and initiatives.
Michigan MI	Not sure.
Minnesota MN	It will necessitate increased resource and information-sharing, but I'm not sure that will happen. My hope would be that organizations and agencies would look at the services that need to be provided and quit looking just at their jobs. If you see duplication, eliminate it, or see how you can complement each other's efforts. That spirit of collaboration would be ideal. What I think will happen is that we'll end up squabbling with one another for the funding crumbs. To survive, we're going to have to have clear firm distinctive missions. I'm not sure we're there yet.
Missouri MO	It will force all programs to come to the table with SLRC and to plan so that duplication of effort is eliminated and resources are used more effectively.
Mississippi MS	Policy will be directed from the Governor's office which will strengthen our policymaking position and hopefully will allow more funds for basic skills training.
Montana MT	Will require more cooperation among providers to reach common goals. Somewhat fragmented currently.

North Carolina NC	Don't know--this is all speculative. Community colleges would continue to receive state funds, and would likely receive available federal funds. Workforce Commission's role as HRIC could be broadened.
North Dakota ND	It's difficult to say at this time.
Nebraska NE	This is very uncertain right now, and may rest with who is selected to administer these funds. My concern is that fund distribution will not be made equitably, and that program favoritism will prevail. Nevertheless, I think it will force our state to more clearly define its literacy initiatives, and begin to bring the wide range of available programs together under a common purpose and vision. It would be nice, for example, to see adult literacy more explicitly addressed via Nebraska 2000, or the Educational Innovation Council, or even by our state's legislative education committee. Perhaps this is a move which will help draw increased attention to adult literacy. Always the chance that adult literacy will be tied directly to welfare reform or workforce development efforts; while this is not all bad, there is potential for employed, non-welfare recipients to no longer have these basic skills resources available to them.
New Hampshire NH	It will be difficult for federally funded library programs to access block grant funds since it is anticipated that block grants funds will be a reduction in overall funding for all participating state agencies.
New Jersey NJ	The SLRC is not involved in funding, policy development and planning. These areas are dealt with by the Office of Specialized Population, Adult Education and Literacy.
New Mexico NM	Too early to say.
New York NY	Will become more directed toward preparation for employment rather than general education goals. If accountability will be job placement, I see recruitment efforts aimed at individuals with higher levels of literacy than heretofore.
Ohio OH	N.R.
Oklahoma OK	Probably some program mergers or transference accompanied by downsizing and staffing reduction.
Pennsylvania PA	The concern is will dollars be spent for education services or spent on training via Welfare and Labor programs.
South Carolina SC	N.R.
South Dakota SD	Will depend on plan that would be provided by Governor's office.

Tennessee TN	Decrease in funding for adult literacy.
Utah UT	Is your crystal ball better than ours? Political jostling will undoubtedly occur. Hopefully, pragmatism will rule.
Vermont VT	Policy is in flux, it's just too difficult to predict. We are trying to position the ABE system to respond to block grant funding. We have introduced a new strategic plan for ABE service provision.
Virginia VA	1) More than ever, various agencies, organizations, entities will be forced to cooperate, coordinate, collaborate to get funding and have funds to adequately meet a certain need/goal. 2) It puts a lot of faith/confidence on the state's personnel to determine what, who, and how programs should be funded. The given is that state government officials know; the fact is, many have no clue, nor any understanding and sensitivity to the plight of the more unfortunate in our society. I feel they will be shortchanged; the present administration's agendas may not put a high priority on the education of adults. Also, the loudest voice may not be the most needy nor the best venue to delivery of services for ABE and literacy.
Washington WA	If the state workforce board ends up in control, adult literacy services will be reduced dramatically.
Wisconsin WI	This is an unknown until it is determined how block granting will be routed (e.g. through education agencies, social service agencies, employment agencies, etc.). We don't know who will make the rules and what types of service deliverers will be favored.
West Virginia WV	Funding: Dependent on whether the funding goes to the SEA or Governor's office--will require a very proactive leadership from adult education. Based on past history of good collaboration and strong reputation of ABE, we hope block grants will provide an opportunity for growth. Planning: Will definitely require collaborative planning with each entity identifying and documenting its strengths. Service provision: Emphasis on employment and training will require refocusing on priorities in service delivery.

Federal support for literacy will likely be provided through state block grants starting in the fall of 1996. How do you think this dramatic shift will affect the adult literacy situation in your state from the standpoint of funding, policy development and planning, and service provision?

F3a
(4)

Local Programs

Alabama AL	No comment. (LVA Anniston Calhoun County, Anniston/Calhoun County Public Library)
Arkansas AR	It will be very hard to secure funding from state block grants. Re competition, will number enrolled affect small literacy councils? (Literacy Council of Hot Spring County, Hot Spring County Library) Block grants will make it harder for libraries and literacy councils to get funding. Policy development and planning will be driven by Adult Education guidelines. (AR River Valley Libraries for Literacy - Reading Together, AR River Valley Regional Library)
California CA	My fear is that funding will be much more difficult for library literacy programs to access. (Adult Literacy Program, Napa City County Library) All depends on the outcome of which agency administers the funds, what strings are attached to the funds, and narrowness of vision. (Adult Literacy Program, Alameda County Library) I think it will have a big effect since libraries in California have been very successful in getting federal grants. If these funds are decreased, or unavailable, we will be competing with each other for funding from other sources. Services will have to be reduced. It will be more difficult to collaborate with each other as we struggle to provide services. (Partners in Reading, San Jose Public Library) In California I believe there is support for our programs and we may do okay. In other states, it may get shifted to job training--that would be a great loss. (Commerce Public Library Adult Literacy Program) Will know the answer to that question (I hope!) when I meet with the state librarian next week. (LVA Marin County, San Rafael Public Library)
Colorado CO	Probably reduce it significantly depending on who controls the block grant. At present it looks like the governor's office, not the education department, will receive the money and give it to junior/2-year technical colleges to provide ABE/GED services. No support seems in the works unless the state library sees this as a source of funds and distributes it to local programs. (Literacy Program, Mesa County Public Library District)
Connecticut CT	We will probably be shut out of funding. (LVA-Greater Waterbury, Silas Bronson Library)
Delaware DE	Depends on who gets control of block grant. Block grant to educate - reduced funding less money. (Project Reads: Sussex County Literacy Council, Sussex County Department of Libraries)

Delaware (cont'd)

The uncertainty of who will be the funding source (Department of Education, Department of Labor, or Governor's Office) in Delaware will greatly affect access to monies. The monies will be significantly less. (LVA-Wilmington Library).

Florida FL

Less will be given to libraries. (Project LEAD, Miami-Dade Public Library System)

The schools will get most funds. We are already doing programs weekly at the schools and in-house without any funding from the school system. We tutor for the GED and Adult Ed gets the credit. We get no funding from them. (Panhandle Library Literacy Consortium, Jefferson County Public Library)

I assume most of it will go to the school system. (Hillsborough Literacy Council, Tampa-Hillsborough County Library System)

With the State Department of Education being given total authority to allocate funding for literacy programs, a dramatic decrease in outreach service to the basic (grade level 0 to fifth) literacy student. (Literacy Program, Brevard County Library)

Unless library directors are born again, or the funds of block grants are only available for literacy, the grants will be written for other services. (Each One, Teach One, Broward County Public Library)

I am unsure how the shift to block grants will affect funding for literacy programs. Everyone I have heard speak about it seems to think that the funding will be reduced. I am not sure if this is because of block grants or because of the shifting of the "in" issues of the day. A few years ago, literacy was receiving much more attention nationally, as well as locally, and would have probably received its fair share of block grants. Today other issues are more prominent. For us to get funding we will have to access it through avenues such as job and career preparation and crime prevention programs. (Center for Adult Learning, Jacksonville Public Libraries)

Georgia GA

At the present time, Adult Literacy funding is primarily in the hands of the Department of Technical and Adult Education with the exception of LSCA funds. Libraries have been shut out of funds that have gone through DTAE. If a block grant approach is instituted, it will mean the elimination of libraries as literacy providers. Indeed, if past experience is any indication, libraries will be left on the sidelines. (Learning Center, Athens-Clarke County Public Library)

These block grants are aimed toward educational facilities and basically omit libraries. Libraries can serve a substantial service. (Literacy Program, Sara Hightower Regional Library)

Fewer dollars available, perhaps as much as 20% less. The political trend is to fund programs emphasizing training for employment. Goals other than employment-related ones will be valued less, i.e. family literacy. Governor will plan a large role and in Georgia we're fortunate that he is an ally of literacy. Block grant money will probably be administered through the Office of Adult Literacy, due to the Governor's support for that agency. Though cooperation is the ideal, literacy providers will need to compete with each other more than in the past for funding. More demands for accountability. (Literacy Program, DeKalb County Public Library)

Illinois IL

If a competitive RFP process, the stronger agencies will survive and those less "evolved" will close their doors. This could be a good thing improving the quality of instruction, services, etc. (LVA-Elgin, Gail Borden Public Library)

N.R. (Family Literacy Partnership, Bensenville Library)

More emphasis on school to work. Not acknowledging that learning to read is a very slow process. Many agencies wanting a piece of the pie. (Libraries for Literacy in Lake County, Waukegan Public Library)

Indiana IN

It is my opinion that block grants to states will most likely result in the funds going to larger, existing state educational institutions and state-level organizations rather than to small, local literacy programs serving local individuals. Also, to adequately disperse funds to many smaller literacy groups would require more personnel and work by state governments than they may be willing to provide. Also, projects that may seem important to a local literacy group might not be considered important by personnel at the state level, which could restrict local program development and policy. (Literacy Program, Michigan City Public Library)

My major fear is that politics will interfere in who receives the grants since literacy is a pet project of our governor's wife. Those who don't support her foundation could face loss of support. (Library Literacy Program, Anderson Public Library)

Realistically? Most of the money block-granted to the state will remain in the large population centers, will be used to maintain programs already in existence (along with their top heavy bureaucracies) and new, innovative programs or programs that serve dispersed and rural populations will be lost. I'm basing this clearly unoptimistic assessment on what happened when Even Start funding started coming to the state for disbursement. (Knox County Literacy Program, Knox County Public Library)

Kansas KS

We believe our funding will be substantially reduced. We believe the majority of our literacy training will be directed toward helping participants develop skills to seek and retain employment. We anticipate grant competition for limited funds. We believe that in order to compete successfully we must become more involved politically with our legislators. (Project Finish, Johnson County Library)

Massachusetts MA

I fear that employment training programs and larger providers will get the larger share of the funding, especially if funding is given to governor's office to dispense. (Read Write/Now Program, Springfield City Library-Mason Square Branch)

We don't think the governor will choose to fund adult literacy programs if he has any choice in the matter. We're concerned that even if he did, it might not be managed wisely, or that it will only go for employment and training. (Center for New Americans, Jones Library)

Not sure. (Newcomer Family Literacy Project, Lawrence Public Library)

Block grant funding opens the applicant field up, but may result in smaller programs being left out. The state agencies should have a service plan which clearly defines the role of library literacy programs. Block grant funding might offer more opportunities to community based projects, but more targeted funds would be better. (Literacy Program, Thomas Crane Public Library)

Maryland MD	More adults will seek services from libraries and volunteer groups. (Project Literacy, Howard County Library)
Michigan MI	It will put basic literacy programs in competition with higher level workforce education programs (for the same pot of funds); also, with public school adult education programs. It quite possibly will dictate outcome performances at a higher level than low-reading or math skill students can accomplish within a limited time frame. (MARC Literacy Program, Greenville Public Library)
Minnesota MN	For ease of administration, the states may disperse funds to school districts, rather than libraries/CBOs. School system will tailor programming to the grant(s) rather than to adult learners needs. (Franklin Learning Center, Franklin Community Library, Minneapolis Public Library) I think it will be more difficult to compete with all of the other programs which also need funding and have dramatic needs--crime and corrections, welfare and public assistance programs, job training programs, health clinics, other educational programs, etc. (Linking Libraries & Literacy for Lifelong Learning, Lexington Branch Library, St. Paul)
North Carolina NC	Probably less available for literacy. (Community of Readers, Glenwood Library)
Nebraska NE	It would be logical that the state funds for adult literacy would probably be channeled through the community college adult basic education system in place now. Some independent literacy organizations, such as PVLA, should not be forgotten in the process. We coordinate closely with the college program so as not to duplicate services, but provide much more tutoring than the state could provide, and also a family literacy program. There should be grant opportunities for all literacy providers, as long as they work closely with state programs so money is not wasted on duplication and competition. I hope that if funds come through state block grants, they will not require restructuring or consolidation with the state ABE program. (Platte Valley Literacy Association, Columbus Public Library)
New Jersey NJ	It may not go directly to the literacy program at the libraries, where learners go as a last resort. Learners may not be able to afford a county college program or may not be able to comply with the registration schedule of the adult school. (Basic Skills for Reading & ESL, Elizabeth Public Library) Block grants might not be adequately and fairly distributed. Most funding will undoubtedly diminish without any foreseeable increase down the road. Funding cuts will seriously affect how much planning and policy development one could pursue. Service provision will be affected. (Literacy for Non-English Speakers, Paterson Free Public Library)
New Mexico NM	We probably will not get as much money and will have to reduce staff and literacy programs. (LVA-Socorro County, Socorro Public Library)

New York NY

To my knowledge, adult literacy funding in New York State has already been drastically affected from lack of federal and state funding. LVA in Catteraugus County and Northern Chautauqua County are supposedly fundless and their work almost at a standstill because state and federal funding through LSCA grants and others have dried up. (Library Literacy Center of Prendergast Library, Jamestown)

Library literacy will be defunded and only hard core work-related programs will survive. (Literacy Program, Brooklyn Public Library)

We have three major concerns about the State distributing grant funding. The first deals with overall funding. Under a block grant scheme, we are concerned that less funding will be available for literacy programs than is currently available. The second deals with administration costs: states will absorb a percentage of block grant funding for administration, which is not currently the case with LSCA Title VI grants (which come directly from the federal government). The third major concern is that literacy programs may not be seen by States to be as important as some other programs covered under the block grant. States will be required to develop a plan on distributing the grants, and will have significant discretion on priorities. (Centers for Reading and Writing, New York Public Library)

Oklahoma OK

Since at present, our funding for our local program does not come from federal monies, we will not be directly impacted. However, our State Literacy Resource Center will be affected. (Moore Literacy Council, Cleveland County Library)

I think this will be quite detrimental. Literacy providers are not highly rated professionally by the ABE providers, who are a part of the State Department of Education. I feel that adult education will get shorted, and literacy, as part of that area, shorted even further. Literacy does not even have a political component, and is largely invisible to state legislators. We would have to adapt to survive; collaborate with job training, family literacy, prison literacy, etc. (Great Plains Literacy Council, Southern Prairie Library System)

State block grants will probably have an adverse effect on literacy programs in our state. If administered by the State Education Department, we would receive no operating funds, only materials funds if the current trend continues. Judging by the governor and legislature who have cut education funding, unless monies were specifically tagged for literacy by the federal policies, very little would find their way to library based literacy projects. (Literacy Council of LeFlore County, Buckley Public Library)

Oregon OR

The reductions in service are likely to be extreme since the state is struggling to pick up federal initiatives in other areas such as health and welfare. (LEARN Project, Eugene Public Library)

Pennsylvania PA

RDP has received little or no information from the state on this initiative. (Reader Development Program, Free Library of Philadelphia)

I think that many agencies will be scrambling to obtain these funds especially if adult education funds are combined with vocational education funds. The bigger urban programs will be trying to get a big piece of the pie. This shift will probably affect in some way the State funding for literacy which is our major funding source. (Bradford-Wyoming County Literacy Program, Bradford County Library)

Rhode Island RI	Block grants take the focus off literacy as a specific issue and do not guarantee that literacy needs will be addressed. If funds are distributed through a large entity like the Department of Education, there is no assurance that literacy programs for adults would be given any priority. (LVA Kent County, Coventry Public Library)
South Carolina SC	Don't know. (Literacy Program, Greenville County Library)
Texas TX	The very low level adults will be ignored because short-term programs cannot help them. The focus will become GED/Job Skills programs which are too difficult for our students to enter. (LVA-Sterling Municipal Library)
	Many of the Library Literacy Programs will be left out of the funding cycle. Monies will be distributed to educational agencies and direct service providers. (Literacy Center, El Paso Public Library)
	I'm not sure our state will share the funds in the best manner. I think our state will filter funds through the Texas Educational Agency and leave the libraries out in the cold. (Proyecto Adelante, Weslaco Public Library)
	Block grants may decrease attention on literacy needs and therefore result in less funding and less service. (Literacy Programs, Harris County Public Library)
	I hope it will have a positive effect. I have to believe that the state legislators understand the great need and will fund all literacy programs in the state. I'm concerned that we will be under the Department of Commerce, which in my estimation would be a mistake. I do agree that these people need job skills, but I believe Adult Education should be monitored by Education Department and not Commerce. (Andrews Adult Literacy Program, Andrews Public Library)
Utah UT	I believe our state monies will be channeled through the ABE and GED programs and through vocational training centers. Because of the uneven quality of volunteer literacy programs and local politics, I don't think libraries or other volunteer programs will see any of those funds. (Bridgerland Literacy, Logan Library)
Virginia VA	Might make it easier to get supplemental funding. (Literacy Program, Newport News Public Library)
Washington WA	I think literacy programs will get preempted and money will be directed toward more high profile areas--crime, health--when in fact illiteracy is a major contributing factor in both. (Project READ, Longview Public Library)
	I'm still learning this aspect of my job. (Library Literacy Program/Lifelong Learning, Seattle Public Library)
Wisconsin WI	We will be fine because we are already involved with the major players. Small players will die. Our libraries haven't been involved. (LVA Chippewa Valley/Eau Claire, L.E. Phillips Memorial Public Library)
West Virginia WV	Funding will be restricted to programs operated by the WV Department of Education. These programs often do not meet the needs of low literacy students. The WV Department of Education spends a large percentage of its adult literacy funding on administration rather than on local programs. (Literacy Program, Monroe County & Peterstown Public Libraries)

Some library literacy personnel are worried that the block grant approach will place libraries at a disadvantage in competing for available state education/literacy funds. What difficulties will you, your organization, or others involved in the provision of library literacy services face if the majority of literacy funding does come in block grant form? F4 (1)

State Librarians

Alabama AL	N.R.
Arkansas AR	We don't anticipate any difficulties with the block grant approach as far as public library literacy programs are concerned.
DC	Situation unknown, to be assessed.
Delaware DE	Depends on what state agency/office controls the block grant.
Florida FL	Block grant for libraries will be administered by state library administrative agency in both House and Senate version, so don't think it will have much of an effect.
Hawaii HI	None
Georgia GA	We already face difficulties because federal funds except LSCA go to the Georgia Department of Technical and Adult Education. They have a very poor record of funding library-based literacy programs.
Iowa IA	Given the structure of Iowa's literacy program, a major impact on libraries is not anticipated.
Idaho ID	Because ongoing operations are not heavily dependent upon federal funding we would experience little impact. However, new programs would have a more difficult time starting up.
Illinois IL	Funding would go to state education agency rather than state library.
Indiana IN	If all funding goes to Department of Education, volunteer library programs will be less able to compete with professional ABE programs in development of grants and follow through requirements.
Kansas KS	The money will be allocated to the State Department of Education, not to libraries.

Kentucky KY	If funding is not given directly to the State Library, there will be great difficulties in obtaining it and being part of policy making.
Maryland MD	None
Maine ME	N.R.
Michigan MI	Libraries with a record of effective cooperation and collaboration in their community should be successful in seeking funds if they continue to show evidence of local partnerships. Isolated projects with no local partners will probably be less likely to obtain funding.
Minnesota MN	Libraries will have a greater problem. In most cases they are not direct providers and instead provide essential support services. Emphasis will likely be placed on funding direct providers.
Mississippi MS	Competition for education funds will present the state with some hard decisions. It would be difficult to project the outcome at this time.
Montana MT	The "unfunded mandate" issue as it plays out in debates between state and federal government levels.
North Dakota ND	Very intense competition with libraries losing.
Nebraska NE	None
New Hampshire NH	It is unclear how funds would be used in our state. Competition will probably be high and library literacy programs low.
New Jersey NJ	We will face more competition for these dollars.
New Mexico NM	N.R.
Nevada NV	If the money is reduced it will go for direct services first.
Ohio OH	We will need to continue to press for the monies we need to carry out library programs. It will be necessary to have the documentation to support our needs.
Oregon OR	We have made it clear that any block grant funds must be earmarked for the state library agency. Otherwise we probably wouldn't see any of it.

Pennsylvania PA	The public library literacy programs will see impacts similar to those of other providers currently receiving federal funding through the PA Dept. of Education. Of more concern is whether these dollars will be spent for education services or spent on training via Welfare and Labor programs.
Rhode Island RI	There is very little communication or coordination between libraries and the State Education Department. There is much resistance in the Ed. Dept. to putting any emphasis on library literacy programs.
South Dakota SD	The amount of funding for literacy will depend on the agenda that is set by state and federal legislation. Any funds for literacy at this time would need to be federal dollars. Block grants administered by the Governor would fund literacy only if it were a personal interest. K-12 education will have priority.
Tennessee TN	Tennessee State Library and Archives development for literacy support has not included direct educational services to adult students.
Texas TX	Block grant will likely be administered by the Workforce Commission, a new agency formed by the last session of the Legislature from parts of other agencies. It is too soon to know how they will deal with libraries.
Utah UT	Uncertain. Depends on the amount of funding received and the nature/approved uses of the funds appropriated.
Wisconsin WI	We would get creamed, since we're so much smaller than the other competitors for these funds.
West Virginia WV	Large fish will gobble up all the food!

Some library literacy personnel are worried that the block grant approach will place libraries at a disadvantage in competing for available state education/literacy funds. What difficulties will you, your organization, or others involved in the provision of library literacy services face if the majority of literacy funding does come in block grant form?

F4
(2)

State Library Literacy Contacts

Alaska AK	There are shortfalls in funding everywhere. Any sources of "undesignated" revenue are likely to be diverted to fill in gaps in current funding levels.
Arkansas AR	We don't anticipate any difficulties with the block grant approach as far as public library literacy programs are concerned. (Identical to Q1)
California CA	LSCA Title VI has been very valuable as a supplement offering flexibility to our library literacy services. Block grants to governor would probably offer more potential than to State Department of Education, but best would be to State Library, as LSTA.
Colorado CO	All adult education in Colorado including library literacy will find difficulties in being heard by employment-oriented groups that will make decisions about block granted funds.
Connecticut CT	N.R.
Delaware DE	May have a difficult political struggle with the Department of Public Instruction in sharing of funding.
Florida FL	Block grants for libraries in Florida will be administered by the State Library Administrative Agency in both the House and Senate versions. Therefore, I do not perceive there to be much of an effect.
Georgia GA	We already face difficulties because federal funds except LSCA go to the Georgia Department of Technical and Adult Education. They have a very poor record of funding library based literacy programs. (Identical to Q1)
Hawaii HI	Minimal.
Iowa IA	N.R.
Idaho ID	At present federal ABE funds do not go to libraries -- so no change.
Illinois IL	Libraries will find it difficult to get funding through block grants to states. Libraries will lose their incentive to be an integral part of the literacy movement in many states which don't have Illinois' state funding for literacy programs.

Indiana IN	If block grants go to state education departments we will again face the need to convince officials that libraries are educational institutions and can be literacy agents.
Kansas KS	The communication style is rigid between agencies. We formed a state organization to promote communication between policy makers on a state level.
Kentucky KY	Great difficulty competing for funds unless they are earmarked specifically for the state library to use for library literacy programming.
Louisiana LA	Not much. We expect the LA Dept. of Educ. to poorly manage this money. But our advocacy and efforts will likely continue at about the same level. (Identical to F3, 2)
Massachusetts MA	This will depend on the attitude of the state librarian and staff. We may get better accountability. We need to see what we are working with first.
Maryland MD	K-12 has higher priority and the needs are more apparent.
Michigan MI	N.R.
Minnesota MN	Libraries must see themselves and be seen by others as essential partners in literacy and all forms of lifelong learning.
Missouri MO	We would need to make a strong case to the governor and Dept. of Elementary and Secondary Education, emphasizing the value library literacy programs can bring to the table. Since the Dept. of Education is traditionally thought of as the agency primarily responsible for adult basic education, we need to emphasize our presence as an essential partner to the overall effort.
Mississippi MS	Mississippi with its limited education funds will be faced with some difficult choices. At this time we cannot project the outcome.
Montana MT	The "unfunded mandate" issue as it plays out in debates between state and federal government levels.
North Dakota ND	Not enough visibility/clout to compete.
Maine ME	N.R.
Nebraska NE	N.R.
New Hampshire NH	N.R.

New Jersey NJ	N.R.
New Mexico NM	Not sure.
New York NY	If the funding is not specifically for libraries, other sectors, primarily schools, will receive the funds. Libraries, community based organizations and community colleges will be fighting for the same reduced funds. (Identical to F3, 2)
Ohio OH	We will need to continue to press for the monies we need to carry out library programs. It will be necessary to have the documentation to support our needs.
Oklahoma OK	We will have to compete with much larger and powerful agencies such as Corrections, Human Services, and Education for funding. These agencies have great influence with the legislature and Governor.
Oregon OR	I think the major difficulty would be understanding the new law, regulations, and the ramifications for libraries in applying. Very few libraries in Oregon have chosen to apply for federal funding to operate library literacy programs, or what they have received in federal funding was clearly a way to get a program started, rather than to fund ongoing operating costs. The block grants probably wouldn't change these approaches to federal library literacy funding unless the ability of the current ABE service providers to provide literacy tutoring changed.
Pennsylvania PA	N.R.
South Carolina SC	Other than LSCA, public libraries have received no money for literacy from federal sources.
South Dakota SD	The amount of funding for literacy in general will depend on the agenda that will be set by the Governor.
Tennessee TN	Poor collections for use by adult students will result.
Texas TX	If the funds are reduced, the services and funds we provide to systems and libraries will be reduced.
Vermont VT	The Dept. of Education would control these funds and use them to fund ABE programs almost exclusively. Libraries would not be eligible (as they aren't now).
Virginia VA	N.R.
Washington WA	Lack of clout. Lack of recognition that library programs are legitimate literacy programs.

West Virginia WV	If the State Department of Education writes an RFP the way they normally do, then the requirements and specifications will be biased. This bias will take the form of education specifications like Certification, Accreditation, and Educational Certificates that are meaningless to the volunteers or librarians.
Wisconsin WI	We would get creamed, since we're so much smaller than the other competitors for these funds. (Identical to Q1)
Wyoming WY	Libraries may be out of the funding loop.

Some library literacy personnel are worried that the block grant approach will place libraries at a disadvantage in competing for available state education/literacy funds. What difficulties will you, your organization, or others involved in the provision of library literacy services face if the majority of literacy funding does come in block grant form.

F4
(3)

SLRCs

Alaska AK	Not applicable in Alaska.
Alabama AL	Competition for funding because they lack (perhaps) a vision and a strategic plan.
Arizona AZ	N.R.
California CA	Being recognized in some states as a viable literacy provider competing for funds with larger entities.
Colorado CO	Colorado has no state literacy funds.
Connecticut CT	Don't know.
Delaware DE	Lack of collaboration and increased competing from decreasing money.
Florida FL	Discussions are currently being held over plans to channel literacy and adult education funds into programs which focus on job preparation and reduce welfare roles. This is shortsighted and leaves out groups such as seniors and families.
Hawaii HI	Minimal effect.
Iowa IA	Only impact will be if total $$ in block grant are significantly lower than funds currently being received.
Illinois IL	Libraries in my opinion will not fight to continue their involvement and management of literacy programs with the block grant format. It has taken quite a while to help some libraries see the significant role they play in literacy; the new funding format will, I think, take us back where we started in that libraries will not find providing literacy services part of their "mission."
Indiana IN	Articulating results.
Kansas KS	N.R.

Kentucky KY	Service provision will be less fragmented as fewer resources will require program consolidation at all levels.
Louisiana LA	Tom Jacques, State Librarian, needs to address this question.
Maryland MD	N.R.
Michigan MI	Not sure.
Minnesota MN	They will need to show how they are utilizing existing resources and how they fit into the bigger picture (job training, welfare-to-work, family skills.
Missouri MO	Libraries are not major providers in our state. I think it will be easy to decrease funding to them. They have not reached out to local programs for the most part.
Mississippi MS	#1 problem will be access. #2 problem will be communicating to both the Governor's Office and the State Workforce Commission the significant role libraries play in our state.
Montana MT	Going up against a much better organized education establishment.
North Carolina NC	Don't know.
North Dakota ND	It's difficult to speculate at this time.
Nebraska NE	This sense of "competition" is indeed a major concern. However, what I would most like to see are programs--including library literacy--joining forces, pooling resources (including $), and ceasing the fight for dollars. If we continue, though, to think only in terms of "my" program, or "our" program, this kind of competition will continue. Libraries do need to be a part of any workforce development boards or planning for statewide initiatives. So do the SLRCs!
New Hampshire NH	Competition for funds will be intense.
New Jersey NJ	N.R.
New Mexico NM	In NM these projects are able to compete well with other local literacy projects.
New York NY	N.R.
Ohio OH	N.R.
Oklahoma OK	Probably increased administrative and managerial demands on reduced staff.

Pennsylvania PA	The State Adult Education Office will have to ensure that literacy resources are made available to service providers and adult students. As "block grant" funds are identified for adult education a line item(s) for library resources should be included.
South Carolina SC	I think they will get the "short end of the stick." Their lobbying group is not as strong in SC as the adult education group is.
South Dakota SD	Will depend on plan that would be provided by Governor's Office.
Tennessee TN	N.R.
Utah UT	Reality: 6 wolves in a pen and only food for 3.
Vermont VT	n/a.
Virginia VA	Library personnel have to be proactive, have initiative in building bridges. This is a situation people in AE and literacy also face; it is important to see themselves as a working part and essential component to a whole, to put aside turf battles and insularity because only by seeing they need each other can they hope to survive.
Washington WA	Library literacy undoubtedly will not be funded out of the Workforce Development Act block grant. However, libraries in Washington currently receive little or no literacy funding beyond LSCA.
Wisconsin WI	State education agencies are not necessarily the ones which will be in control. Library personnel are not alone in their concerns.
West Virginia WV	We are all worried about drastic cuts in funding, especially in trying to document "human relations" gains such as improvements in self-esteem, etc.

Some library literacy personnel are worried that the block grant approach will place libraries at a disadvantage in competing for available state education/literacy funds. What difficulties will you, your organization, or others involved in the provision of library literacy services face if the majority of literacy funding comes in block grant form? F4 (4)

Local Programs

Alabama AL	It will probably go to education programs not to library programs. (LVA Anniston Calhoun County, Anniston/Calhoun County Public Library)
Arkansas AR	Public school education will get the major share and other programs, such as literacy, libraries, and higher education will likely be pitted against each other for the remainder. **Note: It is common to assess and enroll adults into LCHSC that have high school diplomas from this community and others. (Literacy Council of Hot Spring County, Hot Spring County Library)
	Continual unknown funding factor. (AR River Valley Libraries for Literacy - Reading Together, AR River Valley Regional Library)
California CA	N.R. (Adult Literacy Program, Napa City County Library)
	We already receive very little CDE321 funds because of our structure and role in the state. The LSCA Title VI grants allowed us freedom to try innovative projects without competing with other library personnel for nonliteracy library programs. However, with a block grant we may face more competition internally as Library Director encouraging or discouraging applications of new grants depending on priorities. In other words, we will now be scrambling for the same crumbs. (Adult Literacy Program, Alameda County Library, Fremont)
	It depends on whether funding is set aside for literacy. If funding is based on instructional hours (as ABE/321 money is in CA), libraries will be at a disadvantage compared with adult schools. (Partners in Reading, San Jose Public Library)
	In recent years (and only in recent years) we've been able to get direct and equitable access to funding. I would expect that to continue. (Commerce Public Library Adult Literacy Program)
	No experience to date. (LVA Marin County, San Rafael Public Library)
Colorado CO	Unless our state library is committed to library literacy, we will suffer. Most money will go to school/college based ABE-GED programs through the governor's office to junior colleges. Our state library needs to see the value of the programs, which now are left to the state ed department. (Literacy Program, Mesa County Public Library District)
Connecticut CT	Lack of funding. (LVA-Greater Waterbury, Silas Bronson Library)

Delaware DE

Delaware adult basic education programs at State level work with the library literacy programs if there is other funding available to match.
(Project Reads: Sussex County Literacy Council, Sussex County Department of Libraries)

We will probably have a reduced staff, fewer tutor trainings, and serve fewer students.
(LVA-Wilmington Library).

Florida FL

Public schools are a strong competitor for education funds. Libraries are going to be struggling as a whole for general library services.
(Project LEAD, Miami-Dade Public Library System)

There is no funding for literacy. I work elsewhere in the library and the Literacy Coordinator [position] was given to me without additional pay. I accepted as a dedicated person. I am required to have college and I'm paid less than the teachers aides with only high school ed.
(Panhandle Library Literacy Consortium, Jefferson County Public Library)

None that we don't have now: if we get money, fine; if we don't get money, the program will wither.
(Hillsborough Literacy Council, Tampa-Hillsborough County Library System)

With the trend to streamline/consolidate individual federal programs a budget cut for literacy funding is inevitable. (Literacy Program, Brevard County Library)

If it comes to the Department of Education rather than libraries, it will only go to Department of Education.
(Each One, Teach One, Broward County Public Library)

Yes, library literacy programs will have difficulty figuring out ways to access funds available... It means a major shift. Will library programs be able to go into prisons and job placement centers? Some public library administrations will not see this as the role of the public library. It may seem logical to offer a program within the walls of the library, but most will see it as someone else's role to offer literacy programs in nontraditional places.
(Center for Adult Learning, Jacksonville Public Libraries)

Georgia GA

Unless specific funding is set aside for public libraries or rules are developed to insure equal and fair access, libraries will be at a great disadvantage given the current and past thinking of the primary funding agency within this state. They will never be given the opportunity to compete for funds.
(Learning Center, Athens-Clarke County Public Library)

N.R. (Literacy Program, Sara Hightower Regional Library)

We do not apply for state education/literacy funds because we don't offer instruction.
(Literacy Program, DeKalb County Public Library)

Illinois IL

It would be less accessible to us if channeled through the State Board of Education. (LVA-Elgin, Gail Borden Public Library)

N.R. (Family Literacy Partnership, Bensenville Library)

Not getting our fair share. More emphasis on workplace literacy. Enrolling only those people with a higher reading level.
(Libraries for Literacy in Lake County, Waukegan Public Library)

Indiana IN

I believe block grants will most likely find their way to state educational programs and not local library literacy programs, unless a portion of that block grant were initially set aside just for library literacy programs. Needs of a small local program may not seem as vital as those of a statewide organization, such as a vocational college system or ABE system.
(Literacy Program, Michigan City Public Library)

I honestly have no idea. (Library Literacy Program, Anderson Public Library)

Most of the money block-granted to the state will remain in the large population centers and be used to maintain programs already in existence (along with their top heavy bureaucracies). New, innovative programs or programs that serve dispersed and rural populations will be lost.
(Knox County Literacy Program, Knox County Public Library)

Kansas KS

Greater competition for reduced funds. Our program should fare better than others in that we already have a solid partnership developed with the community college to provide literacy services to Johnson County residents.
(Project Finish, Johnson County Library, Shawnee Mission)

Massachusetts MA

No time for lobbying and politicking to be in position to receive funding. Politics will rule even more than they do now if there are no designated funds for adult education separate from employment training, etc.
(Read Write/Now Program, Springfield City Library-Mason Square Branch)

If all the funding is targeted at employment and training, most of our students would no longer be eligible. (We help students who are elderly, handicapped, parents of small children, etc.) Usually they (funders) want to put a time limit on services that would make progress from very low levels into a reasonable proficiency level (in English and reading) impossible.
(Center for New Americans, Jones Library)

I assume that if literacy funding comes in block grant form, it will fall under the aegis of the state department of education. When it frames its rules and regulations and priorities for distribution of funds, public libraries may not get the consideration they need and deserve.
(Newcomer Family Literacy Project, Lawrence Public Library)

The organized educational systems will leave out the library programs as they scramble for funds. Partnerships to date have been very unequal with libraries only tolerated. (Literacy Program, Thomas Crane Public Library)

Maryland MD

Probably none. (Project Literacy, Howard County Library)

Michigan MI

The networking, cooperation, and mutual referrals now being done will turn into competition among agencies to fill quota numbers and other criteria dictated by block grants. Result: many adults will be missed and fall through the gaps in the educational system.
(MARC Literacy Program, Greenville Public Library)

Minnesota MN

Access to funding.
Increase numbers of students who “don't fall” into the niches of grant recipient programs who may feel added pressure to screen in order to guarantee stated outcomes.
(Franklin Learning Center, Franklin Community Library, Minneapolis Public Library)

Minnesota MN (cont'd)	We are a new program funded for one year only with federal funds. Without any additional funds we will continue orientation sessions with the Hubbs Center staff and students, provision of basic literacy materials for circulation and information assistance but it will be difficult to stretch the staff and materials budget to cover even the basics and other areas of the public library service will suffer. (Linking Libraries & Literacy for Lifelong Learning, Lexington Branch Library, St. Paul)
North Carolina NC	Very problematic. (Community of Readers, Glenwood Library)
Nebraska NE	We have been successful in obtaining grants from the State of Nebraska as well as some from private foundations. I believe libraries with literacy programs must be aggressive in looking for funding and keep communications open with other literacy programs in the area. One of the most successful tools for getting grants and using money efficiently is collaboration. Show the state/foundation/private donors how the library is interfacing with the more traditional state supported literacy programs. (Platte Valley Literacy Association, Columbus Public Library)
New Jersey NJ	Other segments of the population may receive a higher priority in receiving funds. (Basic Skills for Reading & ESL, Elizabeth Public Library) How does one guarantee that block grant monies will be available for programs to use or that there will be sufficient funding. What new administrative procedures will have to be navigated in order to apply for block grant monies. (Literacy for Non-English Speakers, Paterson Free Public Library)
New Mexico NM	We probably will not get as much money and will have to reduce staff and literacy programs. (LVA-Socorro County, Socorro Public Library)
New York NY	We don't know yet. (Library Literacy Center of Prendergast Library, Jamestown) Traditional providers will keep all the money, although the whole literacy community feels threatened, not just libraries. (Literacy Program, Brooklyn Public Library) Under the current Senate legislation, library literacy programs would be competing with other library programs for funding. Under the House legislation, library literacy programs would be competing with programs provided by any organization (community based organizations, school districts, etc.) that provide literacy, job skills, or employment programs. Under either scenario, competition for funding will increase. New York Public Library is in a better position than other agencies to deal with increased competition grants. We have years of experience on preparing applications for competitive grants. Secondly, the cost of our literacy programs tends to be lower than those of community based organizations because we do not include rent or utilities in our program budgets (because the programs are housed in our branch libraries). (Centers for Reading and Writing, New York Public Library)
Oklahoma OK	Since at present, our funding for our local program does not come from federal monies, we will not be directly impacted. However, our State Literacy Resources Center will be affected. (Moore Literacy Council, Cleveland County Library)

Oklahoma OK (cont'd)	N.R. -- answered elsewhere. (Great Plains Literacy Council, Southern Prairie Library System) N.R. -- answered elsewhere. (Literacy Council of LeFlore County, Buckley Public Library)
Oregon OR	Our program is so unique in this state that continued funding will be very difficult to arrange. (LEARN Project, Eugene Public Library)
Pennsylvania PA	Since there is no information available, it is impossible to predict the difficulties RDP will have with the block grant approach. However, Philadelphia is an urban anomaly in a predominantly rural state. State government and other counties view the city as a social service drain and seem to resent having to fund programs here. One could speculate that RDP and The Free Library will be discriminated against when block grants are awarded. (Reader Development Program, Free Library of Philadelphia) If the "fair and equitable access" is retained, community based programs should be able to vie for this funding especially if adult education funds are separated from vocational education funds. If community based programs have to compete with larger programs that are doing voc ed/workplace, then it will be very difficult. As long as the State support remains stable, our funding should be ok. (Bradford-Wyoming County Literacy Program, Bradford County Library)
Rhode Island RI	Without specific funds for adult literacy programs, it becomes a power struggle for limited funds among many well-deserving departments. With block grants, it is very possible that funds for literacy will be significantly reduced if not entirely eliminated. (LVA Kent County, Coventry Public Library)
South Carolina SC	I don't understand enough about block grants [to know]. (Literacy Program, Greenville County Library)
Texas TX	We recognize that traditional educational methods have already failed for many adults with low skills. How will their needs be met if most funding goes to traditional educational entities? (LVA-Sterling Municipal Library) Libraries serve as major resource centers for all literacy providers. If the majority of literacy funding comes in block grant form, libraries and community based organizations will be left out of the funding loop. (Literacy Center, El Paso Public Library) I feel our program would survive only if we could get private funds. I feel sure we would get no funds from the block grants. (Proyecto Adelante, Weslaco Public Library) Block grants will make it more difficult for small programs to be funded. They would be lost among larger programs. (Literacy Programs, Harris County Public Library) Don't know. (Andrews Adult Literacy Program, Andrews Public Library)

Utah UT	N.R. -- answered elsewhere. (Bridgerland Literacy, Logan Library)
Virginia VA	A limitation of resources and materials. (Literacy Program, Newport News Public Library)
Washington WA	N.R. (Project READ, Longview Public Library) We would expect difficulties yet the visibility of Seattle Public Library gives it an advantage over many smaller community based organizations trying to get federal/state dollars. (Library Literacy Program/Lifelong Learning, Seattle Public Library)
Wisconsin WI	Unsure. (LVA Chippewa Valley/Eau Claire, L.E. Phillips Memorial Public Library)
West Virginia WV	The W.V. Department of Education is basically opposed to literacy programs being operated by libraries. It will be difficult for libraries to obtain adequate funding. (Literacy Program, Monroe County & Peterstown Public Libraries)

What can national and state leadership organizations do to help you and other literacy/library groups in your state minimize or protect against anticipated problems from the block grant approach? F4a (1)

State Librarians

Alabama AL	N.R.
Arkansas AR	National organizations can continue to provide information, including statistical data, to help plan for the future. Also it would be helpful if consultants were available (free of charge) to travel to individual states to conduct workshops and seminars on subjects of mutual concerns to libraries, adult education, and literacy councils. State organizations can work together to mesh various programs that overlap, duplicate, and are too expensive to run.
District of Columbia DC	Situation unknown, to be assessed.
Delaware DE	Push for block grants to be awarded through LSCA/LSTA legislation.
Florida FL	Don't know.
Hawaii HI	None
Georgia GA	Nothing, it's a state-based problem.
Iowa IA	N.R.
Idaho ID	Recognize us as players.
Illinois IL	In our state it's also an issue of politics, i.e. which state agencies under what elected official will be the literacy leader.
Indiana IN	Be sure that library-based literacy programs are mentioned as intended recipients and encourage State Library Agencies to participate in administration of the block grant funds.
Kansas KS	N.R.
Kentucky KY	Lobby for funding to be given directly to the State Library Agency.
Maryland MD	N.R.
Maine ME	N.R.

Michigan MI	Efforts need to be directed toward building financial support networks at the local level. I do not see significant funding being provided by either the state or the federal government. Planning skills, fundraising and budgeting, and coalition-building will need to be taught.
Minnesota MN	Emphasize that literacy services and programs must be collaborations among multiple providers. Help establish a more solid base of funding through continued advocacy.
Mississippi MS	Communication from both levels on recent developments and aid in the coordination of literacy activities and efforts are essential.
Montana MT	Stress the importance of literacy programs to National Governors' Conference.
North Dakota ND	PR directed at policymakers--governors, legislators, etc.
Nebraska NE	Not sure.
New Hampshire NH	Not sure.
New Jersey NJ	They can continue to lobby for decent funding.
New Mexico NM	N.R.
Nevada NV	Reduce national allotment and send more through the states. Continue strong national awareness campaigns for library roles.
Ohio OH	The professional organizations will have to continually provide the legislators with the need for the literacy programs and the results of the programs that are in existence. Stressing the advantage of cooperative programs and insisting upon them, in order to provide the best local programs, will have to remain a priority issue.
Oregon OR	We are working through COSLA to avoid any problems along these lines.
Pennsylvania PA	Support use of block grant funds for adult literacy/basic education needs.
Rhode Island RI	Encourage passage of LSTA as proposed by Senate, with "block grants" going directly to state library agencies.
South Dakota SD	Federal legislation would need to mark a specific percentage of the ABE funds for literacy programs
Tennessee TN	N.R.
Texas TX	Don't know.

Utah UT	Make sure literacy is mentioned in the legislation.
Wisconsin WI	N.R.
West Virginia WV	What can anyone do except our best?

What can national and state leadership organizations do to help you and other literacy/library groups in your state minimize or protect against anticipated problems from the block grant approach?

F4a
(2)

State Library Literacy Contacts

Alaska AK	Don't know.
Arkansas AR	National organizations can continue to provide information, including statistical data, to help plan for the future. Also it would be helpful if consultants were available (free of charge) to travel to individual states to conduct workshops and seminars on subjects of mutual concerns to libraries, adult education, and literacy councils. State organizations can work together to mesh various programs that overlap, duplicate, and are too expensive to run. (Identical to Q1)
California CA	Support Senate version of LSTA, assuring funds for lifelong learning and literacy through state library administration.
Colorado CO	A specific set aside for all adult basic skills education is about all that would ensure that learners below GED level in CO would still receive services. This should not single out libraries, only include them as potential recipients.
Connecticut CT	N.R.
Delaware DE	Ensure that library leaders have an equal say in decision making regarding funding.
Florida FL	n/a
Georgia GA	Nothing, it's a state based problem. (Identical to Q1)
Hawaii HI	N.R.
Iowa IA	N.R.
Idaho ID	Not sure.
Illinois IL	Provide informational pieces to state education agencies, human resource investment councils and other state structures which may get the block grants to show the value of libraries to literacy programs. Distribute these materials through state libraries and ask them to communicate this information to the appropriate fund receiving structure.
Indiana IN	Make sure legislation mentions public library role specifically.

Kansas KS	Unknown.
Kentucky KY	Issue position statements on use of the funds, models of service, and propose standards.
Louisiana LA	N.R.
Massachusetts MA	I would like to convene another National Library Literacy Forum as a follow-up to one I designed and carried out in Alexandria, VA in 1990. I would like to get funding (under $100,000) and a commitment from DOE, COSLA, and ALA!
Maryland MD	Develop/help us develop better marketing strategies.
Michigan MI	N.R.
Minnesota MN	The problems are ones of our own understanding and commitment.
Missouri MO	We need continued lobbying efforts on the parts of all these individuals and organization representatives.
Mississippi MS	They can keep the lines of communication open between all the diverse literacy and adult education providers and encourage the coordination of literacy efforts.
Montana MT	Stress importance of literacy programs to National Governors' Conference. (Identical to Q1)
North Dakota ND	Block the block grant movement.
Maine ME	N.R.
Nebraska NE	N.R.
New Hampshire NH	N.R.
New Jersey NJ	N.R.
New Mexico NM	N.R.
New York NY	N.R.

Ohio OH	The professional organizations will have to continually provide the legislators with the need for the literacy programs and the results of the programs that are in existence. Stressing the advantage of cooperative programs and insisting upon them, in order to provide the best local programs, will have to remain a priority issue. (Identical to Q1)
Oklahoma OK	Provide each Governor with print information on the importance of library literacy programs and their contributions to the advancement of literacy in the state. Follow the print information with personal phone calls.
Oregon OR	Producing understandable publications explaining the changes would be a help; sharing models from other states.
Pennsylvania PA	N.R.
South Carolina SC	Require education department to look at nontraditional educational programs, non-classroom-based.
South Dakota SD	Mark a percentage of the block grant for literacy programs.
Tennessee TN	Stay strong, collaborate, and have a positive voice with funding bodies.
Texas TX	Educate legislators and funders on the role of the public library in literacy programs.
Vermont VT	Set aside a % for public library services administered by the state library agencies (am I dreaming?).
Virginia VA	N.R.
Washington WA	Keep national and state educational institutions aware of the importance of libraries in literacy. Develop recommendations, steps, and policies.
West Virginia WV	Support a formula that would specify a dollar amount spent for library literacy programs. This could be based on the dollar amounts awarded to the state in past LSCA VI grants.
Wisconsin WI	N.R.
Wyoming WY	Encourage cooperative efforts with all interested entities.

What can national and state leadership organizations do to help you and other literacy/library groups in your state minimize or protect against anticipated problems from the block grant approach?

F4a
(3)

SLRCs

Alaska AK	Good coordination among agencies which receive services.
Alabama AL	Develop a sound plan.
Arizona AZ	Collaborate, collaborate, collaborate.
California CA	Percent set aside for library literacy.
Colorado CO	Our programs are beginning to plan for local/foundation/alternative funding sources.
Connecticut CT	Early discussions and planning among these various groups on how they can collaborate with one another and allocate the funding that will be available.
Delaware DE	Don't know.
Florida FL	Assure that a process for identifying priorities includes adequate representation from a broad range of affected groups.
Hawaii HI	Move toward a PMRIS.
Iowa IA	Target literacy support as required at a level higher than currently being received.
Illinois IL	I'm not certain that anyone can really stem the tide which Congress has let loose about block grant funding. In Illinois, for example, the block grant going to the Governor's Office will probably be a better scenario because our current governor was instrumental in encouraging and funding libraries to provide literacy services. I think that the work has to be done on the state level by those current funding entities to ensure the continuance of library literacy programs. Our $6 million of state general revenue funds will continue to flow for literacy programs.
Indiana IN	Encourage and demonstrate systems of accountability.
Kansas KS	N.R.
Kentucky KY	Encourage consolidation and collaboration.

Louisiana LA	Policy and planning would establish priorities.
Maryland MD	N.R.
Michigan MI	Keep an open mind. It may be an opportunity.
Minnesota MN	Make sure we keep talking to each other and determine among ourselves where we can see efficiencies in cooperation. The key is to eliminate or reduce duplication of effort, something that government often fosters. We need to realistically work at where we can pare down our individual organizations and work cooperatively.
Missouri MO	Make it clear that literacy is a national and state priority.
Mississippi MS	N.R.
Montana MT	Better cooperative planning.
North Carolina NC	N.R.
North Dakota ND	Be part of the planning process at state and local levels. The legislation could set aside funding. Develop positive and meaningful accountability mechanisms.
Nebraska NE	The primary step is to push for increased awareness on the part of policy makers re: the relationship between adult literacy and welfare, unemployment or low employment, corrections, etc. There needs to be a strong, collective voice for adult literacy, and library programs are well-positioned to contribute to that voice; without this, states like our own may very well end up with very little money being put into adult education programs. The media must also be swamped with information and articles related to adult literacy; presently, our local media tend to ignore this. Local education committees need to include adult literacy within their plans and discussions. There needs to be a very clear sense of where each state is wanting to go in terms of working to develop a fully participatory citizenry.
New Hampshire NH	Lobby for increased funding.
New Jersey NJ	N.R.
New Mexico NM	Emphasize coordination of services.
New York NY	Adult educators must have impact in planning and setting goals. The concept of the "quick fix" must be dispelled.

Ohio OH	N.R.
Oklahoma OK	Reduce conflicting portions within public laws through coordination of wording (sic) authorities to eliminate reliance on one law to exclusion of others.
Pennsylvania PA	A thorough identification of need with justification for funding is required regardless of funding approach. Adult Education professional organizations will also play a key role of encouraging support for funding.
South Carolina SC	Designate percentage of each block grant for specific programs.
South Dakota SD	The final legislation can mark a percentage of the block grant for literacy and/or library literacy.
Tennessee TN	We have to be organized at the local level.
Utah UT	Categorize money for adult literacy.
Vermont VT	N.R.
Virginia VA	The block grant approach assumes each state has the capacity, ability, vision and wherewithal to identify who should get funding, etc. I believe we're assuming a lot. In a block grant, I am not certain funding will be evenhanded and just because politicians find it difficult to transcend party lines and individual ambition. Criteria and accountability must be underlined. Agencies/groups/entities must be encouraged to meet first and identify shared problems, interests, goals at the meeting table and plan how they can all work together.
Washington WA	Conveying up-to-date information to state and local organizations.
Wisconsin WI	The law isn't written yet, much less the rules. Proposed legislation gives some hints but it is too early to speculate.
West Virginia WV	Be proactive and become active partner in all reform issues, particularly as political partners. Be able to document and quantify the effectiveness of services, particularly in terms of employment/training. Make sure programs are customer-driven and marketed accordingly. Incorporate technology to a greater degree in delivery of services.

F4a
(4)

What can national and state leadership organizations do to help you and other literacy/library groups in your state minimize or protect against anticipated problems from the block grant approach?

Local Programs

Alabama AL	I don't know. (LVA Anniston Calhoun County, Anniston/Calhoun County Public Library)
Arkansas AR	Designate percentages for library and literacy programs based on current funding. (Literacy Council of Hot Spring County, Hot Spring County Library)
	[Give] funds over expanded period of time--i.e. from 1 year to 5 years. (AR River Valley Libraries for Literacy - Reading Together, AR River Valley Regional Library)
California CA	Define a specific level of funding for library literacy programs only. (Adult Literacy Program, Napa City County Library)
	There needs to be some commitment from each state to allocate a percentage of funds for literacy. The decentralization and block grant approach unfortunately does not ensure that each state will favorably receive funds... My biggest concern is how policymakers define literacy, develop programs, and impose requirements that may narrow our vision of literacy education. (Adult Literacy Program, Alameda County Library, Fremont)
	They should ensure that libraries have a fair share of the literacy funds that are available. It's vital that learners be able to pursue their learning goals and not be limited to job-related goals. About half of our learners are already employed. Nearly 80% of our learners have learning differences/disabilities. They need a very structured sequential approach to get the "building blocks" in place before they can even begin to work on the bigger goals. (Partners in Reading, San Jose Public Library)
	Voice concerns - don't be passive. Increase accountability of program effectiveness. Educate legislators. (Commerce Public Library Adult Literacy Program)
	N.R. (LVA Marin County, San Rafael Public Library)
Colorado CO	Do a major information blitz to state library directors stressing the importance of library literacy programs. Stress the "value of the buck" approach as most library programs use volunteers, not paid tutors. Do a media (TV) blitz showing how the nation would be impacted if all these non- or beginning readers suddenly lost library services, how business, welfare, etc. would be affected. (Literacy Program, Mesa County Public Library District)
Connecticut CT	Realization that this agency provides services not duplicated by ABE which are necessary. (LVA-Greater Waterbury, Silas Bronson Library)

Delaware DE

Make sure funding sources realize that reading is a basic skill that comes before job training or retraining. It is not a skill that needs to be learned only to the benefit of finding employment.
(Project Reads: Sussex County Literacy Council, Sussex County Department of Libraries)

Educate the public and the legislatures.
(LVA-Wilmington Library).

Florida FL

Don't know. (Project LEAD, Miami-Dade Public Library System)

Delegate a percentage to go to public libraries.
(Panhandle Library Literacy Consortium, Jefferson County Public Library)

I am not that familiar with the details of obtaining block grants. Mostly, reinstatement of a line item for library literacy somewhere (LSCA or block grants) would give our programs more credence.
(Hillsborough Literacy Council, Tampa-Hillsborough County Library System)

A state educational budget that clearly allocates funding for specific literacy programs: e.g. volunteer literacy programs.
(Literacy Program, Brevard County Library)

There still will have to be funds made available only for library literacy within the state. If they can get commitments from state departments of education, libraries, and legislatures that can happen.
(Each One, Teach One, Broward County Public Library)

Perhaps these agencies and organizations need to help us see ways to collaborate with other local agencies in the community. Other agencies (local and national) need to be made aware of how libraries have become involved in providing literacy services and what will be missing if these programs are not continued. If the other agencies do not see the value of what we have been doing, it will not be possible to convince them to collaborate (share funding) with us. The leadership to make these connections happen can and should come from the national and state levels.
(Center for Adult Learning, Jacksonville Public Libraries)

Georgia GA

Either set aside adequate funding for libraries or establish guidelines that will give them a fair opportunity to compete.
(Learning Center, Athens-Clarke County Public Library)

N.R. (Literacy Program, Sara Hightower Regional Library)

Insist that adult education/literacy money be administered through state education agencies.
Inform and educate at all levels of government about literacy as an educational program, not a workforce program.
Emphasize the social as well as economic values of literacy programs.
Make certain that effective individuals represent literacy on boards administering block grants.
(Literacy Program, DeKalb County Public Library)

Illinois IL

I don't know. [Perhaps] better planning ahead of time.
(LVA-Elgin, Gail Borden Public Library)

N.R. (Family Literacy Partnership, Bensenville Library)

N.R. (Libraries for Literacy in Lake County, Waukegan Public Library)

Indiana IN

I'd have to study the block grant approach in more detail... Perhaps one answer is to give every literacy organization "equal opportunity" regardless of size or outreach. Another is to allow a small library literacy program its own governance and policy/decision-making without asking it to adopt policies made at the state level. For example, a local literacy group may see its mission as exclusively family-literacy oriented, whereas state government may prefer to give funding for workforce development. Our program was recently denied funding by a state group because our targeted audience was children instead of only adults.
(Literacy Program, Michigan City Public Library)

N.R. (Library Literacy Program, Anderson Public Library)

Easy: don't implement the block grant approach.
Barring that, provide, in block-granting, that x% of monies block-granted must be spent in those counties/parishes in greatest need, based upon % of over-25 population with less than H.S. degree, per-capita income, % of adult population on public assistance, or some similar yardstick.
(Knox County Literacy Program, Knox County Public Library)

Kansas KS

Urge state governors and legislators to continue funding literacy and adult basic education programs in their state at comparable funding levels prior to implementation of block grants.
(Project Finish, Johnson County Library, Shawnee Mission)

Massachusetts MA

Listen to learners' assessments of their experiences in various programs and continue to fund what works for them. Designate a significant proportion of funds for adult basic education without strings to job training or other employment outcomes. Make programs accountable for learners' satisfaction, not just statistics or job attainment.
(Read Write/Now Program, Springfield City Library-Mason Square Branch)

Make sure all students who wish to learn English are included (not just "heads of households," not just welfare recipients, not just employment-tracked students...)
Don't allow unreasonable time limits to be imposed.
Include small community-based providers in the bidding (not just public schools, higher ed, and huge VOLAGS).
(Center for New Americans, Jones Library)

These organizations should follow very carefully the distribution of block grant funds and should be prepared to conduct educational and perhaps even lobbying campaigns on behalf of public library literacy programs. They could also promote state legislation requiring funds to be distributed, as they had been before the block grant approach was instituted.
(Newcomer Family Literacy Project, Lawrence Public Library)

Specific guidelines for funds distribution must be developed with libraries included specifically in the language as service providers.
(Literacy Program, Thomas Crane Public Library)

Maryland MD	Have local/state teams work together so enforced limited services are not duplicated. (Project Literacy, Howard County Library)
Michigan MI	1. Define illiteracy as 0-8th grade reading or math levels. 2. Recognize that a large # of adults cannot learn basic literacy skills in a group/class situation (that's why they didn't learn in school!). 1-1 tutoring has to be a component of all adult education. Designate funds for programs that provide that service. 3. Recognize that illiterate adults need longer periods of time to accomplish functional literacy. It may take a student 5 years of 36-50 hours of tutoring per year. (MARC Literacy Program, Greenville Public Library)
Minnesota MN	Pool funding. Recognize that there are many providers of literacy services--provide forum for discussion/dissemination. (Franklin Learning Center, Franklin Community Library, Minneapolis Public Library) We must highlight our programs, successes, and needs as much as possible to the local and state legislators and governmental bodies so that they are aware of the difficulties we face. (Linking Libraries & Literacy for Lifelong Learning, Lexington Branch Library, St. Paul)
North Carolina NC	Increase awareness. Lobby. (Community of Readers, Glenwood Library)
Nebraska NE	(1) Level the playing field. If money is available to adult literacy programs, give equal opportunity to all who have a valid need for funding. Do not limit grants to new and innovative programs; there are hundreds of foundations out there now that will not fund well established, well-run literacy organizations, only new programs. (2) Make grants renewable for five years or so, subject to receiving positive reports, etc. The hardest part of being an executive director of a nonprofit organization is facing the yearly uncertainty of funding. (Platte Valley Literacy Association, Columbus Public Library)
New Jersey NJ	National organizations could start early to obtain dedicated funds for literacy purposes for libraries. (Basic Skills for Reading & ESL, Elizabeth Public Library) First, literacy must be put on the priority list in the #1 spot. Second, there should be more vigorous efforts to find replacement through private sector sources. (Literacy for Non-English Speakers, Paterson Free Public Library)
New Mexico NM	Have state literacy councils set up workshops so everyone can have input. (LVA-Socorro County, Socorro Public Library)
New York NY	Are you certain that there are going to be any more problems? It seems to me that there has been a lot of waste with government managed education programs, especially on the federal level. The government both state and federal is going broke! I am of the opinion that we should take a fresh look at all these programs and try to eliminate duplication and other unnecessary waste. Perhaps the block grants will bring this about. (My opinion--not the library's) (Library Literacy Center of Prendergast Library, Jamestown)

New York NY (cont'd)	We (NYC Adult Literacy Providers) are meeting today (12/6/95) to develop tactics to deal with block grants. (Literacy Program, Brooklyn Public Library) States should be required to include input from literacy providers who work "in the field" when developing statewide plans for block grant funding distribution. Creation of advisory groups with real influence, consisting of service providers, representatives of localities and other stakeholders, should be mandated. In addition, states should be mandated to create interagency working groups to coordinate grant policies. For example, state departments of labor, education, social services, and employment would all share jurisdiction over areas covered under the House block grant proposal. (Centers for Reading and Writing, New York Public Library)
Oklahoma OK	N.R. (Moore Literacy Council, Cleveland County Library) Work to ensure some literacy funding stipulations within the block grants. (Great Plains Literacy Council, Southern Prairie Library System) Set aside block grant money specifically for literacy rather than tying it to vocational technical programs, work-related programs or other areas. The emphasis on "workplace literacy" and school to work programs is very important, but it ignores the numbers of people we tutor who may never be in the job force because of age, permanent disability. We also tutor those who are already in the job force and I'm not certain what effect these programs will have on these students. (Literacy Council of LeFlore County, Buckley Public Library)
Oregon OR	Give at least a suggested outline of appropriate activities that should be funded to make language and math skill instruction available to as many adults as possible. It is not unusual for adults in this state to be 1-3 hours away from access to instruction. (LEARN Project, Eugene Public Library)
Pennsylvania PA	Grants should be consistent with overall need, i.e. lack of education attainment, poverty, unemployment, etc. Funds should not be distributed to satisfy every geographical area equally. (Reader Development Program, Free Library of Philadelphia) National, state policy, planning, and funding organizations should lobby Congress to ensure that adult education funds remain separate from vocational ed funds and that there continues to be "fair and equitable" access for community based programs to apply for these funds. (Bradford-Wyoming County Literacy Program, Bradford County Library)
Rhode Island RI	Federal funding needs to be reinstated, and adult literacy programs should not be tied exclusively to jobs--this ignores too many people. (LVA Kent County, Coventry Public Library)
South Carolina SC	I think collaboration is as good insurance against reduced funding as anything could be. Developing strong collaborative sentiment among community agencies is the only thing I know to do. (Literacy Program, Greenville County Library)

Texas TX	Recognize that when adults are functionally illiterate they and their children will be limited in their ability to interact socially, economically, and politically with others. Illiteracy does affect all of us--not just a few. (LVA-Sterling Municipal Library) Library advocacy groups need to be vocal about the important role libraries play in serving as resource centers for all educational entities including literacy providers. Library literacy programs in particular meet the needs of a targeted population which cannot attend traditional adult education programs. (Literacy Center, El Paso Public Library) N.R. (Proyecto Adelante, Weslaco Public Library) Design programs within block grant funding that are designed for public libraries. (Literacy Programs, Harris County Public Library) Don't know. (Andrews Adult Literacy Program, Andrews Public Library)
Utah UT	Structure the funding mechanisms so that some monies will channel through to library/literacy or volunteer programs, on a competitive basis. (Bridgerland Literacy, Logan Library)
Virginia VA	Ensure that public libraries are specified to receive a percentage of the funds if they have a literacy program in place. (Literacy Program, Newport News Public Library)
Washington WA	Eliminate expensive bureaucratic requirements. (Project READ, Longview Public Library) Inform local legislators of libraries' important role. (Library Literacy Program/Lifelong Learning, Seattle Public Library) .
Wisconsin WI	Join forces with lobbyists from adult education, volunteer groups like LVA to become a strong voice. (LVA Chippewa Valley/Eau Claire, L.E. Phillips Memorial Public Library)
West Virginia WV	Allocate money directly to libraries or specify that a certain percentage of the block grant must be granted to the libraries. (Literacy Program, Monroe County & Peterstown Public Libraries)

Give state's estimated FY95 funding for all adult literacy programs (incl. workforce, family, ESL, ABE, voluntary). F5 (3)
Or give the amount for the latest year available and specify the year.
Indicate percentage of state adult literacy funding that goes to library literacy programs. F5a (3)
In past 5 years has state funding of adult literacy increased, decreased, or stayed about the same? F6 (3)
F6a (3)

	F5 - State's Adult Literacy Funding		F5a - % state funding that goes	F6 - State's AdLit Funding as a percentage of the total budget over past 5 yrs				F6a - State's AdLit funding in dollar amount of support over past 5 yrs				
	Amount	Year	to LibrLitPgms	Incr	Decr	SAS	D.K.	Incr	Decr	SAS	D.K.	
Alabama AL	4,000,000	FY95	5	1				1				
Alaska AK	3,000,000	FY95	?			1				1		
Arkansas AR												
Arizona AZ	3,000,000	FY96	N.R.			1				1		
California CA	D.K.		D.K.									
Colorado CO	D.K.		D.K.			1				1		
Connecticut CT	23,000,000	FY95	1			1		1				
DC												
Delaware DE	D.K.		D.K.		1				1			
Florida FL	N.R.		N.R.				N.R.				N.R.	
Georgia GA												
Hawaii HI	N.R.		N.R.			1				1		
Iowa IA	1,759,000	FY95	3			1				1		State funding info source: Dept of Ed
Idaho ID												
Illinois IL	25,000,000	FY95	20			1		1				
Indiana IN	1,500,000		10		0.5	0.5		1				
Kansas KS	1,000,000	FY95	20	1				1				
Kentucky KY	N.R.		N.R.	1				1				
Louisiana LA	D.K.		D.K.		1				1			
Massachusetts MA												
Maryland MD	N.R.		N.R.			1				1		
Maine ME												
Michigan MI	D.K.		D.K.			1				1		
Minnesota MN	18,000,000	FY94-95	D.K.		1				1			
Missouri MO	N.R.		N.R.	1				1				
Mississippi MS	8,000,000	FY95-96	D.K.	1				1				
Montana MT	D.K.		D.K.				1				1	
North Carolina NC	29,000,000	FY94	0				1				1	
North Dakota ND	1,500,000	FY94-95	0			1				1		
Nebraska NE	D.K.		D.K.			1				1		No state funding; no access to figures
New Hampshire NH	1,800,000	FY95	0			1				1		
New Jersey NJ	D.K.		D.K.				1				1	
New Mexico NM	4,570,000	FY95	10		1					1		
Nevada NV												
New York NY	D.K.		D.K.	1				1				Date resides in State Ed Department
Ohio OH	N.R.		N.R.				1				1	
Oklahoma OK	500,000	FY95	N.R.				N.R.				N.R.	
Oregon OR												
Pennsylvania PA	20,102,231	FY95	2			1				1		
Rhode Island RI												
South Carolina SC	N.R.		N.R.	1				1				Our state contribution is 3 times our federal.
South Dakota SD	800,000	FY95	0			1				1		Source:Dept of Ed (ABE)
Tennessee TN	N.R.		0	1				1				
Texas TX												
Utah UT	7,134,000	FY95/96	0			1		1				
Vermont VT	N.R.	FY95-96	N.R.		1				1			
Virginia VA	850,000	D.K.			1						N.R.	
Washington WA	18,000,000	FY95	1	1				1				% to local library literacy programs less than 1%
West Virginia WV	2,013,827	FY95	1	1				1				
Wisconsin WI	N.R.		D.K.			1				1		
Wyoming WY												

Note: In only 3-4 instances is information on state funding believably accurate when source is SLRC.
Little can be concluded from this table other than that SLRC's in general are not informed (or in-the-loop) when it comes to state/federal funding issues. This is consistent with fact that so many SLRC's are offices/activities of SEDs, that most are not in leadership roles, and that many are not centrally involved in statewide planning, policy making, and such.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

What % of the state's FY95 funding (or use most recent year) comes from the sources listed below?

F7(3)

Q7

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	
Alabama AL			x					x							No % given
Alaska AK			60			10		10						10	6=Even Start, 8=Nat Guard, BIA 14=Fed ABE
Arkansas AR															
Arizona AZ			70	10	10						5	5			
California CA															Response = Don't Know
Colorado CO															Response = Impossible to answer
Connecticut CT			15			5	3		40	37					
DC															
Delaware DE															Response = Not applicable
Florida FL															N.R.
Georgia GA															
Hawaii HI		27				36									6=PMRIS&SLRC, NIFL, USDE
Iowa IA															Response - Not sure, handled by SDE
Idaho ID															
Illinois IL	1	1	25	5					60			8			9=ISBE General Revenue
Indiana IN		30	30	10			5					5		20	In 96-97, 75% will come from IN Lit Fndtn
Kansas KS									100						Legislative. N.B. Answer is obviously incorrect.
Kentucky KY	1	1	18	1			8	1	46	1	0.5	0.5	2	20	7=JTPA, 9=Adult Ed, 14=VISTA 2%, JOBS 18%
Louisiana LA															N.R.
Massachusetts MA															
Maryland MD															N.R.
Maine ME															
Michigan MI			8												Info Source: MI Dept Ed, not SLRC
Minnesota MN	0.5	0.5	15	1			7		55		4	2		15	11=Corp grants & fees, 14=local levy
Missouri MO															Response = Can't answer
Mississippi MS	1			0	0										6=Even Start
Montana MT															Response = Do Not Know
North Carolina NC															N.R.
North Dakota ND			50				5		30					10	9=State appropriation, 14=Contractual
Nebraska NE															N.R.
New Hampshire NH		5	70						25						9=ABE, adult tutorial
New Jersey NJ															N.R.
New Mexico NM		10	60			20	2				3	5			
Nevada NV															
New York NY															N.R.
Ohio OH															Response = Don't Know
Oklahoma OK															N.R.
Oregon OR															
Pennsylvania PA			60			5			35						
Rhode Island RI															
South Carolina SC			23			6	0.1	0.7	70						6=Even Start, 7=JTPA, 8=SLRC, 9=various
South Dakota SD	1		95			3							1		
Tennessee TN															N.R.
Texas TX															
Utah UT	1	1	24	8		2			64						
Vermont VT	1	1	40	17		38								3	6=ABE, 14=VT Literacy Board
Virginia VA															Response = Don't Know
Washington WA			20				10	10	60	1	1	1	1		N.B. Totals to over 100%, an error
West Virginia WV			33			67									6=homeless 4%, SLRC 1%, ABE 62%
Wisconsin WI															N.R.
Wyoming WY															

Key:
1 = Title I of LSCA
2 = Title VI of LSCA
3 = ABE State Grant Program
4 = Workplace Lit Grants Pgm, USDE
5 = OERI of USDE
6 = Other USDE (specify)
7 = US Dept. Labor
8 = Other federal (specify)
9 = Non-ABE state sources (specify)
10 = Municipal
11 = Corporate grants
12 = Foundation grants
13 = Individual donations
14 = Other (specify)

Note: This information is mostly useless. Little can be concluded from this table other than that the principal source of funding in states is federal/state ABE grants, and that SLRCs are uninformed and out of the loop. Lack of common definitions also seems to be a factor.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Does the SLRC currently have a major role in directing or facilitating the flow of adult literacy funding to the state's local literacy programs, including those based in public libraries? If yes, what form does this role take and with what other key groups is the responsibility shared?

F8
(3)

	Yes	No	D.K.	N.R.	Form/Shared Responsibility
Alabama AL		1			
Alaska AK	1				Advisory through ABE Interagency Committee
Arkansas AR					
Arizona AZ		1			
California CA		1			
Colorado CO		1			
Connecticut CT		1			
DC					
Delaware DE		1			
Florida FL		1			
Georgia GA					
Hawaii HI		1			
Iowa IA		1			
Idaho ID					
Illinois IL	1				Only because Secretary of State Literacy Office operates SLRC does it
Indiana IN		1			have such influence. ISBE controls flow of its own state/federal $ for literacy.
Kansas KS		1			
Kentucky KY			1		SLRC is part of state adult ed agency that grants money to local providers.
Louisiana LA		1			Controlled by a statewide steering committee and adult ed director.
Massachusetts MA					
Maryland MD		1			
Maine ME					
Michigan MI	1				We work with (and fund) the Library of Michigan Foundation's READ INDEED program.
Minnesota MN		1			
Missouri MO		1			
Mississippi MS		1			
Montana MT		1			
North Carolina NC		1			
North Dakota ND	1				
Nebraska NE		1			
New Hampshire NH		1			
New Jersey NJ		1			
New Mexico NM		1			Only with $350,000 in state funds.
Nevada NV					
New York NY		1			
Ohio OH		1			
Oklahoma OK		1			
Oregon OR					
Pennsylvania PA		1			
Rhode Island RI					
South Carolina SC	1				Several grants are administered through the SLRC.Also, our staff reviews local project
South Dakota SD	1				Advisory - share w/state library, ABE, & SD Lit Council. /proposals and recommends
Tennessee TN		1			/funding.
Texas TX					
Utah UT		1			
Vermont VT		1			
Virginia VA		1			
Washington WA		1			
West Virginia WV		1			Minor role.
Wisconsin WI		1			
Wyoming WY					
Totals	**6**	**32**	**1**	**0**	
Percentage	*15*	*83*	*2*		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

G1 If the role of **public libraries** as literacy service providers is to be preserved & strengthened, what half dozen or so vital issues/problems do you think most need attention at the national and state levels? To whom would you most look for leadership in addressing these issues/problems? (Q1, Q2, Q4)

G2 If **adult literacy services** in your state are to be preserved and strengthened, what half dozen or so vital issues/problems do you think most need attention at the national and state levels? To whom would you most look for leadership in addressing these issues/problems? [Note: This question embraces **all** of adult literacy, not just library literacy services. If you need more space, you may add a page.] (Q3)

G3 What state-level or national assistance not now provided to local library literacy programs in your state do you think the programs would most benefit from? What strategies/projects can you suggest for developing the assistance they need? (Q2, Q3)

G4 If an issue or concern of special importance to you has been overlooked in this questionnaire, please feel free to discuss it here. (Q4 only)

G1
(1)

If the role of **public libraries** as literacy service providers is to be preserved and strengthened, what half dozen or so vital issues/problems do you think most need attention at the national and state levels? To whom would you most look for leadership in addressing these issues/problems?

State Librarians

Alabama AL	N.R.
Arkansas AR	Funding to provide space and staff to support library-based literacy programs. Funding for technology--especially for rural libraries. Eliminating barriers to public school-public library literacy cooperatives. Establishing library-votech-industry cooperatives for adult literacy. Establishing purchasing cooperatives for library literacy materials to reduce costs. (State and national government, state literacy organizations, U.S. and state education departments, and task force on the state level with at least half of the membership of English speaking and non-English speaking persons having completed literacy training.)
District of Columbia DC	Increased awareness of the significant number of persons in need of literacy services and direct relationship between parental and children's literacy abilities. Restoration of literacy budgets that were zero-funded by recent congressional decisions. (Library Literacy, Literacy for the Homeless, State Literacy Centers, National Institute for Literacy)
Delaware DE	Provide national and state funding to support library-based literacy programs.
Florida FL	It is not a problem for Florida libraries on the state level. However it is an issue in other states and on the national level where there is a lack of: (a) inclusion of libraries in all appropriate studies, funding allocations, and public awareness programs; and (b) inclusion of libraries at national and state levels in policy and decision-making by boards, steering committees, consortia boards, etc. with regard to adult basic education and English as a Second Language. (For leadership: the American Library Association, and the Department of Education Library Programs.)
Hawaii HI	Libraries = benign, neutral facilities in communities. Libraries = nontraditional teaching and learning, preschoolers, students, adults, senior citizens. Libraries = hardware and software and network access. Libraries = stability.
Georgia GA	N.R.

Iowa IA	Recognition of the potential value of libraries as "community centers" for literacy services. Additional funds to support these additional services. Increased value of libraries and library services. More staff training. Promotion of libraries as centers for lifelong learning.
Idaho ID	Need to be recognized as part of the educational community. More resources, including staff, space, and materials. More publicity and help in identifying populations who can use these services. [Note: In Idaho, the State Library plays more of a coordinating and consulting role rather than administering an ongoing literacy program. What is needed here is probably a better educational effort as to the role public libraries can play and a coalition building effort.]
Illinois IL	Coordination and education. Training. Opening state adult education funding to libraries. Public libraries and business partnerships Computers (We are ready to continue to offer leadership from the state library. If not, a coalition of business, educational leaders and others will be most helpful in our future efforts. We are concerned that on the national level the philosophical differences between literacy providers, educators, and some librarians still need to be addressed. In the meantime, we expect states and local communities to build on what we have been able to achieve in Illinois and we will continue our commitment regardless of money but the shift will be to support rather than actual dollars at the state and local level.)
Indiana IN	There has to be a "consolidation" of effort in programming. Research of more practical impact of literacy vs. cost of illiteracy on our society economically and socially. Continued emphasis on marketing importance of literacy. Recruitment of more partners stating the urgency of a literate America from industry, from service clubs and nonprofits, and from foundations. Even greater emphasis on what a single individual can do to change the effects on another's life, thus the community, and eventually the world. Worker to worker, convict to convict, not just teacher to student. We are all teachers and students all the time. Develop more tools and techniques to teach in group settings via Distance Education etc.
Kansas KS	N.R.
Kentucky KY	Funding - legislature. Models of service - DOE. Standards of service - DOE, ALA, National Coalition. Training (for funding administrators) - DOE. Publicity - DOE.

Maryland MD	N.R.
Maine ME	N.R.
Michigan MI	Adult literacy is just one of the needs that public libraries in Michigan need to address in the coming years, while funding for the daily operation of many public libraries is already inadequate. The library board and staff in each community must assess local needs and set appropriate priorities. At the state level, we will continue to encourage coordination and involved support among academic, library, volunteer, and education groups. We will also continue to seek private sector grants and gifts to support grants through the Library of Michigan Foundation, to encourage library-based adult literacy training. In my view, adult education programs will remain a responsibility of local and state government, while volunteer literacy programs must be community-based. State, federal, and foundation funds should be seen as supplemental to community funding of literacy services. State and national leaders can help by publicizing successful programs, and by assisting with planning, coordination, and fundraising. Literacy organizations can assist by emphasizing fundraising, reporting and fund management as well as literacy training. State libraries can assist with coordination, planning and promotion, and by assigning grant funds as they are available. Funds from state and federal government should be competitive or discretionary, tied to specific projects.
Minnesota MN	Organization of literacy services is different in each state. The state library agencies, state adult ed/GED/ESL office(s) plus state level direct providers need to continue ongoing partnerships. Continuous efforts by the national organizations are needed to remind educators and policy makers of the roles of public libraries in adult literacy efforts. Much much more support must come from businesses. Too many complain abut low skill levels in the workforce while only a few seem willing to invest in their workers.
Mississippi MS	Coordination of literacy programs. Communication concerning literacy opportunities and resources. Increased emphasis on family literacy. Promotion of all library services to the community as a whole. Meeting child care and transportation needs of adult learners. (Some of the needs could be addressed by using one-time grants to establish or enhance local literacy programs. Local funds should be sought to continue the programs.)
Montana MT	N.R.
North Dakota ND	Delivery problems in rural areas.

Nebraska NE	I would only comment that we have some excellent programs and leadership in place now. We would rather promote those efforts in a support role than initiate programs from our office. We do not have the resources to assume a leadership role in library literacy programs, due to many other commitments, not to lack of interest. In part this relates to other agencies and organizations which are leading literacy efforts. The best results occur due to local efforts. National and state organizations need to direct their attention to helping local organizations in literacy programs.
New Hampshire NH	Statistical studies to show the value of these programs. General education to the public about libraries and literacy programs. Communication with non-library literacy providers about the advantage of libraries as literacy providers and literacy partners. Funding!!
New Jersey NJ	The important support role of many public libraries needs to be recognized and stronger publicity into the community needs to bring attention to this service and highlight the public library as a supporting agency.
New Mexico NM	N.R.
Nevada NV	Legislation authorizing/endorsing. Funding earmarked for libraries. High awareness of library role.
Ohio OH	Issues for state library agency/education agency: Emphasis on literacy as a primary function of libraries. Emphasis on cooperative ventures which involve schools/libraries. Stronger emphasis on school to teach children to read, giving them special help to achieve this goal. Issues for professional organizations: Training for library staff interested in literacy projects. Family literacy as a desired program/more opportunities for provider to have exchanges of information.
Oregon OR	I think we have taken a good run at fostering library involvement in adult literacy programs over the past decade or so. Perhaps it is now time for these local projects to sink or swim on their own. I am personally more interested in seeing public libraries strengthen programs for illiteracy prevention as opposed to remediation. I think public libraries can do more to impact literacy by working with preschoolers, their parents, and their caregivers. This is where we are currently putting our emphasis in Oregon.
Pennsylvania PA	Problems/Issues: Need funding for collection development and technology to support the work of literacy providers. (At the state level we would work with the Bureau of Adult Basic and Literacy Education, PA State Coalition for Adult Literacy, and PA Association for Adult Continuing Education.)

Rhode Island RI	Role of libraries as information providers needs to be more widely understood. Role of libraries as centers for lifelong learning at all levels needs to be better understood. Libraries themselves need to be more proactive in this area. There needs to be much more money assigned at all levels (national, state, local, private and public) to support this type of effort. The economic benefits of literacy training (by whatever agencies provide it) needs to be understood and recognized.
South Dakota SD	The need for leaders on both state and federal level to realize that illiteracy is an ongoing problem. Funding for short periods of time, 1-3 years then no funding, does not work. It takes 1-3 years just to develop the local programs and begin to reach the adult student. Funding must be continuous just as funding for elementary, secondary, and postsecondary education. A secure and continuing funding base is required and the leadership for this must come from the federal level. Illiteracy is not a Republican or Democratic issue. It affects all citizens and impacts our economic growth as a state and nation.
Tennessee TN	We would work in a collaboration effort with state adult education leaders. The knowledge and expertise that has developed over a number of years of such collaboration has produced a vast amount of information coming from a number of national organizations. We feel we have an extremely well informed state group.
Texas TX	Funding is the major issue -- we can't do it if we don't get the resources. Competing priorities are another impediment. Turf issues are also significant. (While libraries can play a key role in addressing adult illiteracy, they are not the only agencies involved. What is needed is a well-coordinated effort that uses the contributions of all involved agencies and organizations effectively--a network of providers. We need leadership to help develop such a collaborative approach.)
Utah UT	N.R.
Wisconsin WI	Most important issue is acceptance and visibility of public libraries as literacy providers vis-a-vis other providers, so non-library providers will include libraries in their literacy planning and implementation. On both the national and state levels, library leaders (U.S. Dept. of Education, Institute of Libraries and Museums, NCLIS, ALA, state library agency) need to advocate for the library's role. It would be ideal if libraries were guaranteed a percentage of literacy monies at both the national and state levels, albeit the overall monies would be administered by a different agency, so that interagency cooperation including libraries would be built into the system. The other side of the coin is that national and state library leaders need to work continuously at identifying the other players in literacy, provide this information to librarians at the regional and local levels, helping to create connections at the grass roots level. Again, the leadership should be provided by the groups listed above responsible for advocacy.
West Virginia WV	The media. Churches. Social agencies. Neighborhood improvement concerns. Local agents for change. Every strand in the community network.

If the role of **public libraries** as literacy service providers is to be preserved and strengthened, what half dozen or so vital issues/problems do you think most need attention at the national and state levels? To whom would you most look for leadership in addressing these issues/problems?

G1
(2)

State Library Literacy Contacts

Alaska AK	N.R.
Arkansas AR	Funding to provide space and staff to support library-based literacy programs. Funding for technology--especially for rural libraries. Eliminating barriers to public school-public library literacy cooperatives. Establishing library-votech industry cooperatives for adult literacy. Establishing purchasing cooperatives for library literacy materials to reduce costs. (State and national government, state literacy organizations, U.S. and state education departments, and task forces on the state level with at least half of the membership of English speaking and non-English speaking persons having completed literacy training.) (Identical to Q1)
California CA	LSCA VI helped many small libraries begin modest adult literacy programs, which then transitioned to large-scale CLC. LSCA VI also provided important supplemental funds after year 5, which were included in base for state matching. Both of these functions are greatly needed to assure strong federal/state complementation/partnership. AEA funds have increasingly supplemented CLC funding, but have been relatively small. Increased funding and access to it by CLC libraries would be very valuable.
Colorado CO	Funding - local programs, legislature, work/employment one-stop centers. Publicizing results - state office. (If it's gone, I don't know.)
Connecticut CT	N.R.
Delaware DE	Promoting libraries and reading for their entertainment value is obviously not fiscally prudent in these budget times. We need to be clear that libraries are critical because they provide access to information. We may convince more decision makers of the implications of library use and literacy if we begin modeling information literacy skills for preschoolers. ALA could provide leadership in this area.
Florida FL	I believe that there will always be state library support for public library involvement in literacy in Florida. However, nationally, libraries need to always be one of the significant agencies included in all national research, marketing/pr, and funding initiatives. Libraries need to also be included, by representation, on all top level policy and decision-making boards, committees, consortia, etc. that address literacy education issues. Promotion/marketing of libraries as viable alternative locations for learning to take place--needs to be consistent, high quality, and ongoing. Primary leadership should come from the national professional association (ALA), and the U.S. Department of Education, Library Programs Office. Secondary and/or joint partnership leadership should come from the Dept. of Health and Rehabilitative Services; Attorney General's Office (crime nationwide as it relates to the lack of employability skills, education, etc.); Department of Labor; etc.

Georgia GA	N.R.
Hawaii HI	N.R.
Iowa IA	Publicizing the plight of the non-reader. New adult reader support groups. Expanding volunteer programs in libraries. Expanding new adult reader collections. Preserving funding for state literacy resource centers. For leadership: State Department of Education, State Literacy Resource Center
Idaho ID	Funding. Collaboration. Use of technology.
Illinois IL	Issues Which Need Attention: Building better communication between librarians and educators for more unified approach to literacy enhancement. Better training for libraries and community organizations in a) program development, b) evaluation/accountability, c) establishing standards and measures. Open state adult education funding to libraries--in partnership with educators if that's the only alternative. Developing workplace literacy components and resources by libraries. Providing increased access to computers and available technology for literacy students. Leadership: I would look to an Interagency Coordinating Committee such as we have to address these issues. I must reiterate my appeal to have these national organizations work together on solutions.
Indiana IN	Help in determining what works, successful practices, model coalitions, technology, etc. Public education and public relations. More literacy student involvement in planning, etc. Continued cooperation between organizations at the national and state level.
Kansas KS	Leadership needs to be shared between traditional adult education, community based programs (libraries) and other agencies and organizations. $$ is the main issue of contention and competition. LVA and LLA have the vision to bring the players together at a Literacy Summit. The $ to do the work is the only issue: research, best practices, sharing opportunities and on-going training.
Kentucky KY	Funding - legislative. Models, training, publicity - DOE Standards - DOE, ALA, etc.
Louisiana LA	N.R.

Massachusetts MA	Better examination and dissemination of what works. Technical assistance for library programs, including how to do collaboration, grant writing, and conflict resolution. Ways to address turf issues. **A greater presence of library-based programs at National ABE conferences like COABE and support to attend. (If a librarian is allowed one out-of state trip it is usually to ALA or an LVA conference. They cannot travel without funds.)** We still need to raise the issue/value of library-based literacy to the library community and we need to begin to clean house at home first!
Maryland MD	N.R.
Michigan MI	N.R.
Minnesota MN	What's literacy? - clear definition needed. What is the literacy message? - consistent statement and widespread communication. What is the purpose of the library? - definition, message, communication. What is the citizen's responsibility? How does the citizen understand their connection and what they ought to do? What long-term strategies are needed? (The only leadership that is worth anything in the long-run comes from thoughtful, committed, persistent people.)
Missouri MO	At the national level, we would look for a firm commitment from ALA, emphasizing libraries' role in providing library literacy services. At the state level, we would seek input from the officers of the Missouri Library Association and state librarian to continue our statewide programs.
Mississippi MS	Coordination of literacy efforts. Communication concerning literacy programs, activities, and resources. Addressing the needs of the rural adult learner (e.g. transportation and scheduling problems). Strengthening involvement with workplace literacy programs. Family literacy. Encouragement of reading and library use in the community as a whole. (Some of these need to be addressed on the local level with seed money coming as grants. The community would then need to obtain local support for the programs to continue and gain credibility.)
Montana MT	N.R.
North Dakota ND	Training for rural/small library staff who are mostly "untrained" in librarianship itself.
Maine ME	N.R.
Nebraska NE	N.R.
New Hampshire NH	N.R.

New Jersey NJ	N.R.
New Mexico NM	Development of planning/assessment skills at the local level so that local librarians can determine literacy training needs and the role their library should play.
New York NY	Accountability. Libraries are generally a step removed from being able to assess student accomplishments. Decreased library funding in general. Libraries have other important missions as well as literacy. Literacy is labor intensive. Programs will face cuts. Lack of record keeping. Libraries could benefit from accurately counting adult learner use or working with direct literacy providers whose students use the library. I'm sure there is more literacy activity than librarians are aware of. Legislation on the state and federal level that includes libraries.
Ohio OH	Issues for state library agency/education agency: Emphasis on literacy as a primary function of libraries. Emphasis on cooperative ventures which involve schools/libraries. Stronger emphasis in school to teach children to read, giving them special help to achieve this goal. Issues for professional organizations: Training for library staff interested in literacy projects Family literacy as a desired program/more opportunities for provider to have exchanges of information. (Identical to Q1)
Oklahoma OK	Stable funding resources. We would hope national organizations such as ALA, LLA, and others would help promote library literacy funds. We encourage these and other national organizations to form more partnerships with major businesses to obtain additional funding opportunities. Continuing publicity for library literacy programs. It would be helpful if ALA would take the lead in an organized publicity campaign similar to PLUS (Project Literacy U.S.). Encourage groups such as LVA and Laubach to participate, as well as Center for the Book, PBS, etc. Such a campaign would allow state and local programs to "tie in" and speak with a unified voice rather than a multitude of small, fragmented awareness efforts. Professionalism of volunteers. Help is needed getting the word out that volunteer literacy tutors are providing a valuable service and should be considered "professional." Too often there is a wide separation between the professional educators and the volunteer programs. Record keeping/Accountability. LLA and LVA should determine a common reporting form, make the forms available, and report the results separately and combined so that the impact of library and volunteer community based programs is known.
Oregon OR	The following issues reflect Oregon's situation of ABE programs providing literacy tutoring, assisted by volunteer tutoring organizations. Libraries generally fulfill the role of information and referral providers, along with space provision for tutoring, and to a smaller degree support of adult new reader collections: Envision and promote the library's role in literacy services provision (NCLIS, Center for the Book, Dep. of Ed., ALA, state library associations, state libraries). Preserve funding for education institution literacy tutoring (State Dept. of Education staying on top of federal and state funding proposals that affect literacy funding. Effective testimony from current students, tutors, and ABE programs.

Oregon OR (cont'd)	Fulfillment of National Education Goals. If schools were successfully graduating students who learned to read and compute math, libraries may not need to preserve their literacy role (Dept. of Education, State Dept. of Education, state legislature for funding of schools). Encourage corporate donations/funding to volunteer tutoring programs (NCLIS, Center for the Book, Dept. of Ed., ALA, national volunteer literacy organizations). It is also vital that libraries do more to prevent the need for literacy services. Oregon's state aid for public libraries is targeted on improving library services to children/youth, with an emphasis on preschool children: Encourage more library-daycare outreach, library-Head Start partnerships, library-parent contact, "Born to Read" type and family literacy programs in libraries (NCLIS, Center for the Book, Dept. of Ed., ALA, state library associations, state libraries, state legislature for increase in state aid).
Pennsylvania PA	N.R.
South Carolina SC	Steady, ongoing source of funding for literacy programs. Greater advocacy of libraries' role in supporting community literacy efforts. Encouraging literacy agencies to use all community resources.
South Dakota SD	The need for leaders on the state and federal level to realize that illiteracy is an ongoing problem. Funding for short periods of time, 1-3 years then no funding, does not work. It takes 1-3 years just to develop the local programs and begin to reach the adult student. Funding must be continuous just as funding for elementary, secondary, and postsecondary education. A secure continuing funding base is required and the leadership for this needs to come from the Federal level. Illiteracy is not a Democratic or Republican issue. It affects all citizens and impacts our economic growth. (Identical to Q1)
Tennessee TN	The most important issue will be in dealing with personalities of leadership. Whether that leadership (1) understands all the issues of an uneducated citizenry; whether that leadership (2) has an agenda that is totally uninformed.
Texas TX	Funding for materials, staff, and training. Convincing legislators that they have a vested interest in helping reduce illiteracy--educated voters, educated citizens. Convincing legislators that in small, rurally isolated communities, there are not enough volunteers to provide literacy and ESL programs. Distance learning would help, funds would help. Funds for permanent staffing of literacy programs. Better perception of what literacy programs provide and their value to communities.
Vermont VT	In our state the literacy people in general do not consider libraries as essential to fostering literacy. They consider them resource centers primarily and generally view programming as secondary or nonessential. Yet public libraries have sponsored a number of fine reading discussion programs and family literacy programs for new adult readers. They have set aside space for tutoring and developed small collections for students. The literacy community in the state talks about the need to collaborate with other agencies but often leaves libraries out of the loop. It creates barriers by using acronyms and technical language non-educators do not understand or see reasons to use.

Vermont VT (cont'd)	The best collaborations occur on a small scale and at a very local level. Some librarians have been frustrated by a lack of continuity and commitment on the part of individual ABE tutors. They feel the managers promise increased tutor support but do not always follow through.
Virginia VA	N.R.
Washington WA	Recognize library literacy programs as legitimate programs. Coordinating with local literacy programs instead of competing. Getting the smaller and medium-sized libraries aware of the literacy issues and enthusiastic about developing programs. Convincing library directors that literacy should be addressed even though there are budget cuts.
West Virginia WV	**Funding is the critical issue library literacy programs face.** Libraries are notoriously underfunded. Library-based literacy programs would be difficult to maintain without funds earmarked for literacy. **Awareness is also an issue.** Though problems of illiteracy have been brought to the public eye in recent years, many people do not view it as a problem that affects them personally. Increased awareness of the social and financial aspects of illiteracy may generate an interest in helping combat the problem. **Awareness that literacy efforts are not a short-term problem or goal.** With the scope of the problem, as cited in the National Adult Literacy Survey (42% at the lowest 2 levels of literacy proficiency), this nation needs to commit to long-term solution. With the literacy awareness efforts of First Ladies (Ms. Bush and Ms. Rachel Worby, WV, and others) taking on the issue as a part of their husbands' terms, I think the public may have thought the problem would disappear in 4-8 years. When several community groups were recently approached to assist in literacy efforts, they responded that they already did that and thought the issue was resolved. Literacy will not be resolved as part of a campaign platform or a 1-year community project. We must commit to lifelong learning. Early intervention would help at-risk children and adolescents and prevent the increasing number of illiterate adults. Programs where libraries and schools work together to assist in helping children achieve in school that start in the first grade and follow them through as needed is one example. Libraries have found that after school homework and/or tutoring sessions have been very successful. Across the state, a variety of programs are offered that include but are not limited to peer tutoring, resource sharing, tutoring and any assistance as needed. 4. **Training for tutors and trainers on a consistent basis.** With the constant advances in discoveries in reading disabilities and the possible solutions or methods used, the trainers often feel out of date. However, the cost of attending training sessions nationally is very expensive and often impossible.
Wisconsin WI	N.R.
Wyoming WY	N.R.

If the role of public libraries as literacy service providers is to be preserved and strengthened, what half dozen or so vital issues/problems do you think most need attention at the national and state levels? To whom would you most look for leadership in addressing these issues/problems?

G1
(4)

Local Programs

Alabama AL	N.R. (LVA Anniston Calhoun County, Anniston/Calhoun County Public Library)
Arkansas AR	Continuation of library loan collections (AR State Library) available through literacy council and library shelves (State Library staff). Library/literacy relationships strengthened in every county (address at county, regional, and state levels. Avoid block grants (update and contact legislators at local and state levels). Cutback of standards and measures set up for fully staffed (paid) adult education programs. Small literacy programs have 1-2 paid staff, all others volunteer. (Literacy Council of Hot Spring County, Hot Spring County Library) Issues: Responsibility Library has toward supporting literacy. Direct role of librarian as educator. Public recognition of the need to provide funding. (AR River Valley Libraries for Literacy - Reading Together, AR River Valley Regional Library)
California CA	Funding. (Adult Literacy Program, Napa City County Library) A concerted effort to incorporate a discussion about literacy services in library schools to ensure that librarians understand the role of library literacy. Strong state advocacy and a greater role in coordinating and communicating issue between library literacy programs; serious discussion about the role of volunteers and the need to professionalize the service; greater voice from the field in the development of policies that affect programs. (Adult Literacy Program, Alameda County Library, Fremont) Need a stable source of funding. Too much time is spent searching for $$ instead of creating quality programs. Projects are created to impress funders rather than focusing on effective basic services. Need research on what methods work and what don't. A lot of tutoring goes on that generates positive feelings but isn't really effective. Local government needs to understand magnitude of literacy problem so they will be more inclined to fund library literacy programs at a higher level. There hasn't been a national public awareness campaign in quite a while. (Partners in Reading, San Jose Public Library) Funding maintained or increased. Family literacy--bring the parents in with the children. [For leadership]: City Council, State Library (Commerce Public Library Adult Literacy Program) N.R. (LVA Marin County, San Rafael Public Library)

Colorado CO

Progress of students, shown to the public.
Funding - anywhere.
Cooperative service - between ourselves.
Transportation in many areas.
Our State library turned literacy and ABE/GED all over to the State Adult Ed Department. Locally our Human Services Council, library board, and business leaders know of the value of our program and the integrity of the staff. I would continue to look to them. Our state literacy coordinator is also very helpful, but her position will close with lack of LSCA funding. The Adult Education Department of the state is also helpful.
Cooperative efforts exist between the library;, college, school district, and Rocky Mt.-SER.
(Literacy Program, Mesa County Public Library District)

Connecticut CT

N.R. (LVA-Greater Waterbury, Silas Bronson Library)

Delaware DE

Learning to read is really important even with technology becoming the be-all end-all.
Libraries do indeed have a place in the education of adults.
Evaluation tools and measures cannot be the same as ABE/GED measures.
Not all people want to learn to read to become employed.
(Project Reads: Sussex County Literacy Council, Sussex County Department of Libraries)

N.R. (LVA-Wilmington Library).

Florida FL

Publicity is a major issue.
(Project LEAD, Miami-Dade Public Library System)

Public libraries should receive funding from DOE if we are going to service the schools.
It should be mandated that libraries have at least a 1/2 time literacy coordinator paid by county to ensure continuance of programs.
(Panhandle Library Literacy Consortium, Jefferson County Public Library)

Vital issues:	Look to:
1. Funding	1. State Library
2. Publicity	2. Local media
3. Recruitment of volunteers	3. Every agency with direct public contact

(Hillsborough Literacy Council, Tampa-Hillsborough County Library System)

It is imperative that public libraries be given access to federal grant monies for use by library-based literacy programs. Having to compete with local ABE programs for funding is not productive for either. (Literacy Program, Brevard County Library)

Funding available to libraries only.
Some structure outside the Department of Education that oversees allocation of funds to volunteer, grass roots, and library programs regardless of whether they do it the way the Department of Education does.
More emphasis on various approaches, less on numbers.
More focus on student needs and perceptions.
(Each One, Teach One, Broward County Public Library)

Florida FL (cont'd)

How to get the most "bang for the buck." How can the dollars we do get be used to help the most people?
We must try to get more local funding through the local city government. If we continue to be funded with "soft" money, we will always be in danger of having to close our doors.
More attention within our state library association to literacy issues. (I have not attended the state library association conference for the last several years because there were no literacy-related issues on the program.) More awareness campaigns need to be carried out within public libraries.
Within each public library when roles are being discussed, someone must speak out for literacy. The public library is a lifelong learning center in the fullest sense of the word. We must become advocates for the 23% of our adult population who are functionally illiterate.
On the national level I would to the American Library Association for leadership. On the state level, the State Library and the Florida Literacy Coalition have been very effective. Locally, the Friends of the Library as well as the library board should be the leaders. There are other local groups, such as the local Laubach group, who count on the library for some services and should be a willing advocate if called upon.
(Center for Adult Learning, Jacksonville Public Libraries)

Georgia GA

Public library leadership is essential in this field. The State Library will have to commit more than "lip service" to literacy if we are going to make any headway. Right now, the state emphasis is on technology. They have to be made to realize that technology is a natural tie-in to literacy or vice versa. However, someone will have to make it a priority.
The leadership must recognize that libraries can and do play a major role in solving literacy issues in a community. This requires solid planning and a greater emphasis on advocacy and promotion.
Libraries must have access to adequate funding if they are to continue to play a pivotal role in literacy.
(Learning Center, Athens-Clarke County Public Library)

N.R. (Literacy Program, Sara Hightower Regional Library)

Lack of funding at all levels.
Lack of recognition by library leaders (directors, trustees, etc.) and of many libraries of the importance of library literacy services.
Need for higher level of cooperation among all literacy agencies/organizations to present a united voice.
Accountability/measurement of outcomes.
Need for library representation on any boards, such as the proposed Workforce Development Boards, that will make decisions on allocation of funds.
Educating decision makers--governor and staff, legislators, county commissioners, congressional leaders--to the value of literacy programs not directly connected to employment.
Leadership: local literacy coalitions, our governor for whom literacy is a priority, state library agency, GA Office of Adult Literacy, GA Library Association, ALA, GA State University Center for Adult Literacy and other literacy research centers, National Center for Family Literacy, NIFL, Schools of Library and Information Science, NCLE, AAACE.
(Literacy Program, DeKalb County Public Library)

Illinois IL

Sufficient funding.
Qualified staff.
Sufficient number of volunteers.
Public awareness of issues.
Community support.
Support from outside personnel (e.g. board members, service clubs, etc.)
Leadership: Secretary of State Literacy Office.
(LVA-Elgin, Gail Borden Public Library)

N.R. (Family Literacy Partnership, Bensenville Library)

N.R. (Libraries for Literacy in Lake County, Waukegan Public Library)

Indiana IN

Support of library literacy services by local and state library administrators, to include not just funding but provision of qualified personnel and also moral support and encouragement.
Professional education of library literacy program administrators in the fields of literacy, adult education, reading, or education, so that they can be held in the same esteem as a professionally educated librarian.
Widening the scope of library literacy programs to include services for children as well as adults. Too many children fall through the cracks at school.
Cooperation between other library personnel and library literacy programs personnel in areas of publicity, public awareness, recruitment, etc.
Adequate funding for materials, equipment, clerical assistance.
Local and state library officials would need to address the above issues, and perhaps the state education department.
(Literacy Program, Michigan City Public Library)

Funding.
Support on all levels.
The general public needs to understand that the problem still exists and that volunteerism can help.
Literacy providers continue to need answers about how to help with specific problems such as learning disabilities, dyslexia, apathy, etc.
Keeping adult education and literacy programs off the cutting block. People still need us.
Accountability. How can we really prove we have an impact on people's lives? Do statistics really mean anything?
Frankly, I don't know who to ask for help with my concerns. I'm going just about anywhere I can--the State Library, Internet, books of lists of funders through foundations, other providers.
(Library Literacy Program, Anderson Public Library)

The Problems:
Money for personnel, training, and staffing adequate to address program needs.
Illiterate people are very often unaware that they have problems and need help, never approach us for service.
Whom I look to for solutions:
Local and community foundations first,regional and state philanthropic organizations second, government at all levels third.
Community/county volunteers and media, especially non-print.
(Knox County Literacy Program, Knox County Public Library)

Kansas KS

Community partnerships between libraries and educational institutions, community centers, etc., need to be encouraged as a means of maximizing literacy services to the community.
Additional funding sources need to be located in order to maintain and improve existing programs.
Staff and volunteer tutor training needs to be maintained.
(Project Finish, Johnson County Library, Shawnee Mission)

Massachusetts MA

N.R.
(Read Write/Now Program, Springfield City Library-Mason Square Branch)

ESL literacy - Many providers will not accept ESL students who are not literate already and many providers need training in how to teach these students.
Equity issues - We can't expect to hold onto good teachers and volunteer coordinators if they make less than half of what public school teachers make!!!
(Whole) staff education - Our entire library staff here has been wonderful in assisting and welcoming students to the library. But other libraries/library workers can be rather daunting to limited English speakers/newcomers. It is critical that ***all library workers*** know how to deal with newcomers with sensitivity and compassion.
Qualifications - Coordinators, teachers and volunteer trainers must be ABE professionals, not librarians. They must have adult education credentials/experience and be paid accordingly.
(Center for New Americans, Jones Library)

Facilities development (construction $$)
Technology acquisitions.
Staff development - train staff to use new technologies, train staff about new literacy resources available.
Improve relations with public education system.
More literacy volunteers.
We would look to the School Department, State DOE, SABES (MA State System for Adult Basic Education Support), congressional leaders, the President.
(Newcomer Family Literacy Project, Lawrence Public Library)

The educational community working with public libraries would provide the greatest leadership on literacy.
A more tolerant, less exclusive educational philosophy at state and federal level must drive policy issues that affect funding and instructional opportunity.
Learning disabilities and ADD are critical issues in the success of students and the choice of curriculum or instructional material.
More people who provide direct service to adult learners need to be more familiar with technology in order to instruct and develop programs.
(Literacy Program, Thomas Crane Public Library)

Maryland MD

Validation from the state level of the importance of literacy in public library's missions given shrinking funding for libraries in general.
Continued availability of funding for the external high school diploma program.
More publicity on the scope of the U.S. literacy problem and its economic implications.
At one point LITERACY was in the long-range goals for libraries in Maryland. Three years ago, after the White House Conference on Libraries denied literacy as one of the major goals, many local programs lost their literacy funding. Our State Library System supported a multi-million dollar "Lifelong Learning Library" at the Enoch Pratt Free Library. It is now a "regular" branch. Two other counties have limited literacy programs supported "in-kind" by their libraries.
(Project Literacy, Howard County Library)

Michigan MI

Guidelines for training volunteers as a high level of instruction is maintained by all literacy programs across the state. (I would look to our state literacy agency, Michigan Literacy Inc.)

Designate funds specifically for library literacy services separate from other adult education funds or workplace education. (I would look to the federal department of education and libraries. Also to the National Institute for Literacy to be our advocate in Washington, DC, as well as LVA &Laubach.

(MARC Literacy Program, Greenville Public Library)

Minnesota MN

Libraries need to recognize literacy learning center services are essential. They are also a great outreach and marketing tool, especially when some libraries are wondering why circulation is dwindling.

Libraries could take THE lead regarding information highway access.

Adequate staffing.

Collection $.

Adequate facilities PR.

(Franklin Learning Center, Franklin Community Library, Minneapolis Public Library)

Any stability in funding with block grants or programs would enable us to plan more effectively for the future. This is probably an impossible dream given the nature of federal, state, and local funding.

Not losing the funding for basic literacy materials and services with the rush to use technology effectively. Technology can be very helpful but we still need basic materials for new adult readers, GED test study guides, audiocassettes for those who know Hmong and are learning English, etc. This needs to come from all levels.

Any ways to increase staffing to cope with the increased demand for time-intensive services to new readers and immigrants in our community. This is a local budget issue with lobbying needed by Friends and advocacy groups to inform government officials.

Leadership: ALA, PLA, Adult Lifelong Learning Sections have been invaluable for me in providing collection assistance, personal contacts throughout the country, ideas for programs or problem-solving, etc. They have provided a strong leadership role and information for ALA's Legislative network for lobbying.

(Linking Libraries & Literacy for Lifelong Learning, Lexington Branch Library, St. Paul)

North Carolina NC

Staff training.

Public awareness.

More collaboration with other agencies.

Coordinated fundraising.

Technology!

(Community of Readers, Glenwood Library)

Nebraska NE

In our state the majority of literacy programs are sponsored by the state funded adult basic education through the community colleges. The libraries do not play a large role in out-state Nebraska. In order to strengthen the library literacy services, and in order [to avoid] duplicate programs, the libraries and community college ABE coordinators must work together. In many communities there is the opinion that there is not a need for adult literacy assistance. What many people do not realize is that literacy levels which were acceptable 20 years ago no longer meet the needs of industry and our computerized society.

Workplace literacy must be supported in some way by the community's industry. At the present time in Columbus, our on-site literacy classes are free of charge to industry, unless they request more instructor time than

Nebraska NE (cont'd)

we have budgeted. In that case, we provide materials and the teacher at their site, and they pay a flat salary to us for the instructor.

Our state senators will have a larger role in designating funds in the future. We must request that they visit our programs, listen to our needs and realize that literacy is an important part of making our citizens self-sufficient.

We are working hard to educate our community about what PVLA is about. We hope to see positive results in support through volunteerism and donations.

(Platte Valley Literacy Association, Columbus Public Library)

New Jersey NJ

Vital issues are funds for training and matching tutors with learners, and payment to tutor trainers for running the literacy program. Generally speaking, writing to legislators brings a response to any questions and comments.
(Basic Skills for Reading & ESL, Elizabeth Public Library)

Issues: Funding...personnel...training...technology...partnerships with other organizations [including] school system and businesses...commitment to literacy, particularly family literacy...support from local, state, and federal governments... increase awareness of literacy's importance on local, state, and national level... and providing sufficiently trained personnel to work in library literacy programs.
(Literacy for Non-English Speakers, Paterson Free Public Library)

New Mexico NM

N.R. (LVA-Socorro County, Socorro Public Library)

New York NY

Better use of available funding (there may not be any new funding).

Within our state department of education designate and maintain a commitment of a certain portion of state education income to be used for library services. Board of Regents has control of this.

Re-establish the liaison link between the state library and local libraries.

Local libraries should develop other sources of funding and try to minimize dependence on state and federal sources.

(Library Literacy Center of Prendergast Library, Jamestown)

State needs to look at progress made in library literacy programs.

Ability of libraries to attract adults who are gainfully employed but wish to better themselves.

(Literacy Program, Brooklyn Public Library)

Having library literacy programs eligible for educational funding sources other than those specifically designated for library literacy programs.

Library leadership needs to raise public awareness about library literacy programs and publicly support continued and expanded funding specifically for literacy.

The accomplishments of library literacy programs need to be documented and disseminated.

Library literacy programs need to be able to quickly adapt to the changes in the literacy community and restructure programs in order to meet the needs of the clients in areas such as welfare reform, workfare and job training.

Professional educators need to be included in the design and implementation of library literacy programs.

There needs to be a partnership between librarians and adult literacy educators.

Leadership and direction: Needs to be provided by local library directors, the state librarian, and professional librarian organizations such as ALA,PLA, and NYLA in partnership with local literacy education directors, State Education Departments and national education organizations such as IRA and NCAL.
(Centers for Reading and Writing, New York Public Library)

Oklahoma OK

Outreach is our most pressing problem. There are still areas of Oklahoma that do not have any literacy programming at this time. If our State Literacy Resource Center is affected by the block grant issue, it will directly affect the start up of new programs and the extended life of small, underfunded programs.
(Moore Literacy Council, Cleveland County Library)

Provide funding for a state level literacy office to receive and diffuse issues and information.
Continue funding for tutor training.
Continue the SLRCs. They have been invaluable in compiling information.
Provide research and development in adult learning theories and teaching practices.
Continue the ESL tutoring/teaching program development.
(Great Plains Literacy Council, Southern Prairie Library System)

More cooperation between the State Department of Education and volunteer library-based literacy providers. Recognition from State Education Departments of the success rate of and effectiveness of volunteer groups.
Some form of continuing financial support for literacy providers to provide for ongoing and continuing literacy efforts.
Recognition that achieving literacy skills carries implications beyond the purely economic or work-related skills.
We currently look toward the OK Department of Libraries which provides strong, ongoing support for library literacy programs. The OK Literacy Coalition, a statewide volunteer organization of literacy providers, also provides resources, training and support. Would like to see greater support from the State Department of Education, state government and national literacy organizations such as Laubach Literacy Action and Literacy Volunteers of America.
(Literacy Council of LeFlore County, Buckley Public Library)

Oregon OR

Continued improvement in training for BOTH paid staff and volunteers.
Continued improvement in books, materials, hardware and software.
Provision of resources to instructors, volunteer tutors, and students.
Space for teaching.
Addressing learning problems.
Recognition of volunteer efforts.
Leadership: Libraries need to be a part of leadership.
OCCS - Oregon Literacy Inc.
Professional organizations for funded and volunteer programs.
Schools, businesses, vocational, rehab, employment, welfare, and corrections agencies.
(LEARN Project, Eugene Public Library)

Pennsylvania PA

Coordination -- there is not a sense that each participating institution has a unique role under the guidance of the state library or state literacy agency.
Duplication -- as a result of the above, there is unnecessary duplication of services. This should be eliminated in the interests of economic and bureaucratic accountability.
Funds -- technology costs $$$$$. Even the paperback books purchased by RDP are increasingly expensive: $8.72 is the average price per book in 1995;in 1993, the average price was $5.67.
Leadership -- One very effective "group" that provides leadership is the NLA: National Literacy Alliance Public Policy List (listserv). Besides delivering information on literacy legislation, policy, and funding, it functions as a"call to action" when

Pennsylvania PA (cont'd)

intervention is warranted. The messages relating to the Congressional budget hearings inspired even this passive participant to write to PA's senators and representatives to inform them of the impact of reduced adult literacy funding on their constituents.
(Reader Development Program, Free Library of Philadelphia)

Funding.
Public awareness.
Use of technology.
Student recruitment.
Increased awareness of the value of library literacy programs.
Awareness that literacy is involved with many other social issues.
Local: Adult education agencies, county government.
State: Adult education organizations (PAACE and Tutors of Literacy in the Commonwealth), State Director of Adult Basic & Literacy Education, State Legislators.
National: Laubach Literacy Action, Literacy Volunteers of America, US Congressmen.
(Bradford-Wyoming County Literacy Program, Bradford County Library)

Rhode Island RI

Space for literacy programs in libraries.
More attention given to family literacy programs.
More help for tutors in learning how to work with learning disabled adults.
More research on the extent of adult illiteracy in the U.S. and its measurable effects on families and in the workplace, nationally and statewide.
(LVA Kent County, Coventry Public Library)

South Carolina SC

The increasing gap between opportunity-rich and opportunity-poor. In SC, rural areas tend to be even further out of the loop and more underfunded than other areas.
Mistrust between agencies and parts of the state, especially in times of diminishing funds.
Leadership: I would leave the state out of it and concentrate my efforts at coalition building among local agencies and the wonder human resources at the federal level, which exist in people like Judy Stark at Education who is helping us with our grant. I think libraries themselves are the perfect institutions to take the lead -- democratic, public, omnipresent. The ALA may already be putting forth leadership efforts. I 'm just not aware of it.
(Literacy Program, Greenville County Library)

Texas TX

Increasing number of adults with ESL needs.
Preserving a stable funding base for volunteer literacy programs.
Educating the public about how illiteracy affects everyone.
Establishing a linkage between library services and literacy services (how each benefits the other).
Local government and community groups are now active proponents of literacy services; however, I don't see any real future leaders for literacy on the state/national level.
(LVA-Sterling Municipal Library)

Texas TX
(cont'd)

Issues/Problems:
Staffing - additional staff will be required for new lab.
Funding - for strengthening and updating collections.
Outreach - media campaign for public awareness and to recruit students.
Volunteers - for individualized instruction.
Curriculum development - for Hispanic populations.
Assessment - easy and affordable for student placement.
Leadership:
Local: Library Director, City Council, residents, BRLA
State: Legislators, TX State Library, Governor,TLA
National: Congressman, Senator, President, ALA
(Literacy Center, El Paso Public Library)

N.R. (Proyecto Adelante, Weslaco Public Library)

Libraries keeping pace with technology.
Funding for materials and technology.
Attracting diverse populations to the library.
Recognition of libraries as the infrastructure of education.
(Texas State Librarian, TX Library Association, TX State Library, Knowledgeable legislators on state and national level.)
(Literacy Programs, Harris County Public Library)

Funding.
More trained teachers (paid). Volunteers really work out well, but many are limited in what they can do.
Legislators need more training--both local and state.
(Andrews Adult Literacy Program, Andrews Public Library)

Utah UT

I think staff people, especially in outlying areas, need more training and staff development.
Programs would benefit from more effective instructional approaches.
More networking and coordination between programs is needed.
Stable, ongoing funding.
(Bridgerland Literacy, Logan Library)

Virginia VA

The removal of blocked funding from the state. An increase of state funding would allow the literacy program to expand, as well as meet student needs with the necessary materials and resources.
(Literacy Program, Newport News Public Library)

Washington WA

Family literacy needs to be strongly addressed. All programs providing services to those in need should be educated in how literacy impacts what each is attempting to do. (Project READ, Longview Public Library)

At Seattle Public Library, the future of literacy provision rests with the commitment of the board and the will of our city librarian. Currently there is a strong will.
We have to fit in with the existing literacy network as a collaborator, not an 800 lb. gorilla.
We have to educate our staff to best serve this new group of patrons.
We don't have enough space to provide the service we'd like.
We will continue to work within SPL and the local literacy network to address these concerns.
(Library Literacy Program/Lifelong Learning, Seattle Public Library)

Wisconsin WI	Librarians need to realize libraries serve people who have survival needs not just those who read words. Library staff must become more global and embrace partnerships. With everyone looking for measurable outcomes we must work together. Libraries are so governed by rules and regulations, it's difficult for them to see how they can [offer] volunteer literacy programs. Perhaps a nationwide staff development project would educate staff about the needs of the adult learner and the trained volunteer. (LVA Chippea Valley/Eau Claire, L.E. Phillips Memorial Public Library)
West Virginia WV	Adequate and consistent funding - national leadership. WV Library Commission is very supportive but does not have funds. (Literacy Program, Monroe County & Peterstown Public Libraries)

If **adult literacy services** in your state are to be preserved and strengthened, what half dozen or so vital issues/problems do you think most need attention at the national and state levels? To whom would you most look for leadership in addressing these issues/problems? [Note: This question embraces *all* of adult literacy, not just library literacy services.]

Alaska AK	1. Make literacy one of the welfare priorities. 2. Guarantee minimum funding for literacy. 3. Increase computer use. 4. Provide more staff training. 5. Hire more full-time literacy instructors.
Alabama AL	N.R.
Arizona AZ	In AZ, the SEA Office of Adult Education and Literacy and GED Testing Services, SEA/ADE School-to-work office, Governor's staff on school-to-work, USDE Ron Pugsley, NIFL Andy Hartman. Issue for USDE--use funding for independent contractors more judiciously.
California CA	Develop national view of literacy that encompasses workforce but not totally associated with jobs/work. See literacy as critical family issue with work one aspect. Address all literacy in a "family literacy" context. More involvement of adult learners in decision-making process. NIFL could lead the way!
Colorado CO	A broader more humanistic philosophy or outlook on education, which encompasses and acknowledges the role of adult education. A realization that there is no quick fix, and that job training/placement is not a substitute for basic skills training. Respect and support of parents as role models and teachers, and as essential to children's successful literacy acquisition as the K-12 system. Adult learners taken seriously as citizens, constituents, voters.
Connecticut CT	N.R.
Delaware DE	Don't know.
Florida FL	N.R.
Hawaii HI	More coordination of resources. More networking and cooperating.
Iowa IA	Awareness of the issue. Stop allowing students to go through K-12 without obtaining literacy skills. Require businesses to require literacy skills prior to employment. Implement penalties for not achieving--i.e. no driver's license if you can't read, etc.

Illinois IL	In Illinois we have built strong interagency support for literacy as the foundation for success for our residents. The uncertainty of funding in the future has made us look closely at how we work and how we can make the best use of our limited resources. We will be looking closely as technology and distance delivery systems supported through state and local resources which will bring information into all people in a community that can also benefit our literacy clients. The closer to home the funding can be, the more missions and policy match the needs in that home community. We all must make certain that there is an ongoing awareness of those needs and how all benefit from seeing that those needs are met.
Indiana IN	At the state level: Produce a comprehensive biennial plan which coordinates literacy policy and program development. Implement the state's biennial plan through regional coordinating councils to build a seamless learning system. Encourage local programs to become more entrenpreneurial. Encourage private sector providers to co-locate with public sector providers. Increase the capacity of co-located public-private sector initiatives to account for outcomes. Encourage local programs to expand opportunities for individual tutorials to children. Stimulate exchange of successful learning strategies between learning systems for adults and children. [When giving grants to increase literacy skills], give applicants as much latitude as possible in defining their proposal and funding needs, subject the proposal to a cost-benefit analysis, and negotiate the funding amount as needed. Require each proposal to include volunteers as one component of the initiative.
Kansas KS	The literacy field must become more professional, accountable,and politically aware. Literacy is only one aspect of adult education and, as with all education programs, should be led by professional educators.
Kentucky KY	Ensuring that adequate resources are available will continue to be an issue. With block grants and performance standards, the least educated, most in need may not be the priority target population for the limited resources. This will widen the gap between the "haves" and "have nots" in Kentucky. Economic development and workforce development must develop hand in hand for success of both initiatives. This problem needs attention at both the state and national levels. Typically each has struck out alone.
Louisiana LA	The priorities of the national leaders (Executive AND Legislative Branches) drive the state leadership because of funds. The priorities of the next administration (within the state) will heavily impact the distribution of all block grant funds.
Maryland MD	N.R.
Michigan MI	Not sure.
Minnesota MN	They will need to show how they are utilizing existing resources and how they fit into the bigger picture (job training, welfare-to-work, family skills)

Missouri MO	Libraries are not major providers in our state. I think it will be easy to decrease funding to them. They have not reached out to local programs for the most part.
Mississippi MS	#1 problem will be access. #2 problem will be communicating to both the Governor's Office and the State Workforce Commission the significant role libraries play in our state.
Montana MT	Going up against a much better organized education establishment.
North Carolina NC	Don't know.
North Dakota ND	It's difficult to speculate at this time.
Nebraska NE	This sense of "competition" is indeed a major concern. However, what I would most like to see are programs--including library literacy--joining forces, pooling resources (including $), and ceasing the fight for dollars. If we continue, though, to think only in terms of "my" program, or "our" program, this kind of competition will continue. Libraries do need to be a part of any workforce development boards or planning for statewide initiatives. So do the SLRCs!
New Hampshire NH	Competition for funds will be intense.
New Jersey NJ	N.R.
New Mexico NM	In NM these projects are able to compete well with other local literacy projects.
New York NY	N.R.
Ohio OH	N.R.
Oklahoma OK	Probably increased administrative and managerial demands on reduced staff.
Pennsylvania PA	The State Adult Education office will have to ensure that literacy resources are made available to service providers and adult students. As "block grant" funds are identified for adult education, a line item(s) for library resources should be included.
South Carolina SC	I think they will get the "short end of the stick." Their lobbying group is not as strong in SC as the adult education group is.
South Dakota SD	Will depend on plan that would be provided by Governor's office.
Tennessee TN	N.R.

Utah UT	Reality: 6 wolves in a pen and only food for 3.
Vermont VT	n/a.
Virginia VA	Library personnel have to be proactive, have initiative in building bridges. This is a situation people in AE and literacy also face; it is important to see themselves as a working part and essential component to a whole, to put aside turf battles and insularity because only by seeing they need each other can they hope to survive.
Washington WA	Library literacy undoubtedly will not be funded out of the Workforce Development Act block grant. However, libraries in Washington currently receive little or no literacy funding beyond LSCA.
Wisconsin WI	State education agencies are not necessarily the ones which will be in control. Library personnel are not alone in their concerns.
West Virginia WV	We are all worried about drastic cuts in funding, especially in trying to document "human relations" gains such as improvements in self-esteem, etc.

What state-level or national assistance not now provided to local library literacy programs in your state do you think the programs would most benefit from? What strategies/projects can you suggest for developing the assistance they need?

G3
(2)

State Library Literacy Contacts

Alaska AK	Libraries in Alaska - as elsewhere - have had to cut back in many areas after the "boom years" when funding was strong. Good intentions for literacy programming have succumbed to trying to maintain some level of basic services. Unless a new, stable source of revenue is found, libraries are unlikely to take on new programs. Space is also a problem; many libraries in Alaska were built with oil money and are now crowded and in need of repair, with no relief in sight.
Arkansas AR	Increased cooperation with activities between other adult education providers and local public libraries. Provision of more cooperative funding opportunities on federal level for pubic libraries and other literacy agencies.
California CA	Funding for library literacy services (increased).
Colorado CO	No opinion.
Connecticut CT	N.R.
Delaware DE	Our libraries rank low nationally and we are striving to develop basic services. Hopefully, literacy will receive more attention once our libraries receive more support.
Florida FL	A mechanism to determine the long-term impact tutoring/program support provided by libraries make in the lives of those served/tutored once they leave the program (e.g. #/% that go on to pass GED, get a trade or continue in college, get degree, become employable). National tracking system that provides feedback.
Georgia GA	N.R.
Hawaii HI	N.R.
Idaho ID	N.R.
Illinois IL	In light of the coming changes which block granting might bring, I suggest they will need assistance with resource development either through coordination with other agencies or through other sources such as foundations, Friends of the Library groups, civic organizations, etc.
Indiana IN	Help in determining what works, successful practices, model coalitions, technology, etc. Public education and public relations. More literacy student involvement in planning, etc. Continued cooperation between organizations at the national and state level.

Iowa IA	N.R.
Kansas KS	N.R.
Kentucky KY	Data collection. Distribution of information.
Louisiana LA	N.R.
Massachusetts MA	We really hear little directly from ALA or from COSLA. A lot of the literacy activities are promoted from this agency outward to the public libraries and at an interagency level. We need to teach state agencies to do both horizontal and vertical collaboration (see Nickse & Quezada *Community Collaborations for Family Literacy Handbook*).
Maine ME	More funding to assist program development. Targeting special interest volunteers (Friends etc.) to assist in setting up programs, services, places to tutor, and materials in libraries. Strategic planning sessions on a local level. **This needs to be a grass roots project but the state library can provide facilitators.**
Maryland MD	N.R.
Michigan MI	N.R.
Minnesota MN	N.R.
Missouri MO	Targeted library literacy resources including speakers, resource materials and lobbying information.
Mississippi MS	The development of family literacy programs. Raising community awareness of the value in providing family literacy pgms. Family literacy needs are being addressed in two ways in the state: (a) Some libraries in the state participated in the Viburnum/ALA Rural Family Literacy Workshop and are seeking funds through the project to conduct family literacy projects in their communities. (b) The Mississippi Library Commission has committed approximately $75,000 to assist public libraries in enhancing and developing library programs directed toward young children at risk.
Montana MT	N.R.
Nebraska NE	A wage-based program (presently volunteer-based). Continuance of the University Clearinghouse.

New Hampshire NH	More detailed information about library literacy programs around the country, for networking and sharing. E-mail addresses of other on-line library literacy programs. Student and tutor "chats" or "pen-pals" online. Perhaps a voluntary questionnaire about programming to other library literacy programs.
New Jersey NJ	N.R.
New Mexico NM	N.R.
New York NY	Statewide conferencing. Technical assistance. Data collection and analysis.
North Dakota ND	Training students/trainers in use of technology to develop literacy skills.
Ohio OH	We are working with other agencies that provide literacy support. I have been assigned to "literacy" within the last year and am still making contacts. I will continue to work with them to support cooperative projects.
Oklahoma OK	Better networking between each other, other states, and national resources. Computer access and training may encourage better communication. Stable funding for library-based literacy programs. It is hard to operate any program, much less volunteer programs, with such uncertain funding sources. National awareness and promotion of library literacy programs would be very beneficial.
Oregon OR	Develop library literacy leaders through a national training institute similar to the ALA Intellectual Freedom Leadership Institute. A train-the-trainers approach could help spread the message back in the states. The passion for literacy services must be extended.
Pennsylvania PA	Assistance is provided through the Pennsylvania Department of Education's Bureau of Adult Basic and Literacy Education.
South Carolina SC	A clearer focus on what library literacy programs are in relationship to formal educational efforts. Public libraries often do not receive credit for their efforts.
South Dakota SD	N.R.
Tennessee TN	N.R.

Texas TX	Clearinghouse and/or assistance programs that bring together literacy providers to share materials, evaluation, and knowledge. Funding for materials, equipment, and staff. Cannot depend on volunteers much longer. Long-term financial support.
Vermont VT	Funds to develop collections and purchase technology for self-instruction as well as funds to coordinate community collaboration.
Virginia VA	N.R.
Washington WA	N.R.
West Virginia WV	Training. Awareness campaign. FUNDING.
Wisconsin WI	N.R.
Wyoming WY	Title VI LSCA helped several library literacy programs in the past.

What state-level or national assistance not now provided to local library literacy programs in your state do you think the programs would most benefit from? What strategies/projects can you suggest for developing the assistance they need?

G3
(3)

SLRCs

Alaska AK	Channel funds through existing literacy network - 20 regional providers.
Alabama AL	At the national level you need to be a stronger advocate for networking. Stop funding so many entities. You are creating and currently advocating duplication of services.
Arizona AZ	N.R.
California CA	Statewide library literacy newsletter (quarterly). Publication (regularly) of abstracts of successful library literacy activities/programs.
Colorado CO	They currently receive technical assistance from our office of adult ed; if federal funds are lost, they will need state/local support.
Connecticut CT	Funding directly to programs or for the establishment of new programs based on existing successful models.
Delaware DE	N.R.
Florida FL	N.R.
Hawaii HI	Family literacy. Training and technology.
Iowa IA	Electronic hook-up.
Illinois IL	I would like to see ILA and ALA more active in promoting and sponsoring training for librarians in effective literacy efforts and partnerships. I realize that there have been some attempts such as the ILA and Head Start video, but there's much more that could be done. We also need to promote literacy in libraries through the local communities which support public libraries. School libraries could also play a significant role in literacy. Our experience indicates that libraries sometimes don't have a clear understanding of what they can do in literacy.
Indiana IN	[Need] stable revenue stream. Become more entrepreneurial and approach business committee about what it needs--Kevin Costner's Field of Dreams approach doesn't work well.
Kansas KS	N.R.

Kentucky KY	Funds and curriculum for technology and technology training. Continue Title VI funding. More policy and supervisory support for library literacy personnel. Consolidate literacy funding from all sources to single source.
Louisiana LA	Federal - Title IV. LEH funds depend upon NEH funds. Given the current climate, I do not know what strategies might be effective.
Maryland MD	N.R.
Michigan MI	Marketing -- to maintain literacy as a national focus. Individual entities do not have resources or expertise to keep issue alive over time.
Minnesota MN	Funding assistance and better ways for linking with existing programs. Chances are, somebody, somewhere, has done what you want to do. Facilitating some collaboration or just resource sharing is critical. More funding for the SLRCs would help. That (is) was part of the SLRC mission as set out in the National Literacy Act--facilitate collaboration and resource sharing. In our case, our SLRC didn't ever get a chance to get going.
Missouri MO	The libraries need to become a part of local programs, but ABE programs do not include them in their partnerships. Our SLRC is trying to develop closer linkages with libraries. Family literacy programs have formed better relationships with libraries.
Mississippi MS	Develop models that will strongly link the programs to both the State Workforce Council and schools.
Montana MT	Stronger connection among the programs--meetings, electronic, etc.
North Carolina NC	N.R.
North Dakota ND	Training for state library personnel in understanding their role in the literacy movement.
Nebraska NE	State: Assistance in terms of establishing cooperative relationships, enhancing awareness of other programs and opportunities within each community for learners. Because of their position within most states, the SLRCs are well-positioned to provide this function; however, it also demands a commitment from the state in terms of carrying this out. National: There is much that could be done within this same area in terms of providing the library commission and local libraries with specific information on how to cultivate such cooperative relationships.
New Hampshire NH	Continued funding would add to the stability and long-term planning for these programs.
New Jersey NJ	Generating awareness of library staff to benefit involvement in literacy movement.
New Mexico NM	N.R.

New York NY	N.R.
Ohio OH	N.R.
Oklahoma OK	N.R.
Pennsylvania PA	N.R.
South Carolina SC	Not sure.
South Dakota SD	The continued funding for SLRCs to assure the continued access to the latest materials for the new reader and the literacy tutor.
Tennessee TN	N.R.
Utah UT	Consult librarians. Discussion.
Vermont VT	New reader awareness - break stereotypes. Need info on materials and presentation/promotion of materials for new readers.
Virginia VA	Leadership that is visible, action-oriented, and able to initiate working partnerships with adult education and literacy programs (public and private). Give library personnel "release time" to attend adult ed and literacy workshops that will facilitate developing skills and knowledge in helping adult learners. **What is obvious of course is: more funds to support their literacy work.**
Washington WA	Don't know.
Wisconsin WI	State and national funding should find ways to allow and facilitate collaborative planning and delivery of services.
West Virginia WV	The LSCA Title VI grant is now gone. It was extremely helpful before in providing materials and software.

If an issue or concern of special importance to you has been overlooked in this questionnaire, please feel free to discuss it here.

G4
(4 only)

Local Programs

Arkansas AR	Adequate training to work with minorities. (AR River Valley Libraries for Literacy - Reading Together, AR River Valley Regional Library)
California CA	Need to raise awareness of connection between learning disabilities and low literacy skills. Literacy providers/organizations tend to favor whole language approach, which is not effective with many dyslexic adults. We are training our tutors to work with dyslexic individuals. However, this has required specialized training for our staff and intensive monitoring of tutors. Making this commitment means we can serve fewer individuals at one time. However, we feel that we are providing better service, and we can demonstrate greater accountability. National ALLD Center is doing a great job disseminating information, but there needs to be more advocacy for learners with LDs. (Partners in Reading, San Jose Public Library)
Colorado CO	As funds have been allocated for adult training, libraries are usually not considered or even thought of as a source. When job skills were mandated for food stamp recipients, the college's ABE program was given the contract. Our program could and would serve these clients, but the library was not contacted. However, I must add that most libraries don't see literacy service as a primary part of their mission, thus taking themselves out of the circle. (Literacy Program, Mesa County Public Library District)
Florida FL	If libraries take a position of decreased support of literacy programs, it is sending a message that they will implicitly not provide access to at least 20% of the population (see National Literacy Survey). This is inconsistent with other outreach efforts to special groups (seniors, youth, minorities, et al). (Hillsborough Literacy Council, Tampa-Hillsborough County Library System)
Illinois IL	Literacy providers need to be more proactive. Just because we use volunteers [doesn't mean we're not] a very professional agency. Some libraries (not ours) view literacy as a bother. (Libraries for Literacy in Lake County, Waukegan Public Library)
Massachusetts MA	Because adults seeking literacy instruction keep a very low profile, they are not visible or vocal. This is a population without a voice. With the rise in technology and its pervasiveness in the workforce, they have to contend with a tremendous barrier to accessing information. With low job opportunity, low literacy skills, inability to access information through print or computer technology, will anything ever change for them quickly enough to effect a difference for themselves and their families? (Literacy Program, Thomas Crane Public Library)
Michigan MI	Share your analysis of these surveys with all state literacy agencies and state departments of education, [and] with education committees in the federal legislative arena, the President, and Congress. (MARC Literacy Program, Greenville Public Library)

Minnesota MN

Libraries are more than stored memories! They are increasingly becoming community centers and this should be supported/celebrated. Libraries have been heralds to immigrants/new readers. They still can be, but some seem prone to confusion about their roles.
(Franklin Learning Center, Franklin Community Library, Minneapolis Public Library)

Because Minnesota has a strong collaborative of literacy services and support groups our perspective can be very different from a state that does not have this structure and the local library is the literacy service provider.
(Linking Libraries & Literacy for Lifelong Learning, Lexington Branch Library, St. Paul)

Nebraska NE

Availability of stable funding has always been a concern of nonprofit organizations. Most private foundations do not want to fund ongoing programs or salaries for staff. At the current time, 50% of our funding is through the Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA VI). We feel we have a vital, well organized adult education and tutoring program; yet, from year to year, it is difficult to find funding. The LSCA grant has traditionally covered salaries and materials. There must be recognition at the state or local level that adult literacy programs must be given at least partial stable funding, so we can continue providing adults and their children literacy skills.
(Platte Valley Literacy Association, Columbus Public Library)

New Jersey NJ

Assessment programs for basic math and tutor training videos and materials for math tutors would be helpful.
(Basic Skills for Reading & ESL, Elizabeth Public Library)

New York NY

There is evidence that the functional illiteracy of many American adults may have a severe effect on our economic health. Yet, even if jobs were available, if they can't read well enough they can't work those jobs. Adult education,which is not a part of public education anymore, seems to have become a stepchild of library services which for the most part are underfunded in New York State. The public schools used to conduct adult basic education, ESL, etc. Now it seems to be up to agencies such as PIC, literacy groups such as LLA & LVA. I am hoping that block grants to the state will make public education more accountable and that out of monies designated for public education there will be a set amount for libraries that libraries can count on especially if they are to take over the role of adult education.
(Library Literacy Center of Prendergast Library, Jamestown)

Oregon OR

The importance of basic language and math skills to our economy is about to be diminished in the frantic quest for a quick fix in work-related skills programs. If we don't help those with minimum skills get to the level where they can enter job training, society will have to support them in one way or another.
(LEARN Project, Eugene Public Library)

Pennsylvania PA

The National Adult Literacy Survey of 1993 received only a split second of media attention, but it was the most far-reaching survey of adult literacy in the U.S. This survey seems to have been forgotten, but it found that 90 million adults lack the literacy skills necessary to function in today's world. This survey points to a national crisis which seems to have been overlooked and forgotten by many.
(Bradford-Wyoming County Literacy Program, Bradford County Library)

Texas TX	My concern is meeting the needs of a primarily Hispanic population; many of the students served are illiterate in their native language and it is difficult to find appropriate materials for native language literacy instruction. (Literacy Center, El Paso Public Library)
Utah UT	Libraries should be in the business of providing services to all of their patrons, not just the literate population. As our society becomes more diverse and access to information becomes more critical, libraries have a responsibility to enhance or sponsor literacy efforts. Focus groups have revealed that our students value computer instruction alongside their literacy instruction. Childcare and work schedules often interfere with participation. We need to respond better to childcare and transportation needs. (Bridgerland Literacy, Logan Library)

CONTENTS:

6. Library Agency Program Data (Q2 only)

LAPD1	Does your state agency collect data on the library-based literacy programs in your state? If yes, please give your best estimates to questions 2-4. If no, skip to question 5.
LAPD2	There are about (number inserted from NCES E.D.TABS July 1995) public libraries and library branches in your state. How many of them offered adult literacy services 5 years ago and how many do today? If you do not have 1995 figures, please give the latest available and indicate the year. (Services may include one or more of the following services: provision of book collections for adult beginning readers; provision of print and/or computer learning materials; space for classes and other meetings; on-site tutor training; on-site student instruction/classes; promotion, community referral, and other support activities.) [Note: Service-area population sizes given in the question range from 1,000,000 plus to less than 1,000.]
LAPD3	Of those libraries offering services in 1995, how many in each population group have the following characteristics? [Note: 8 choices given having to do with staffing and extent and nature of services.]
LAPD4	Of those programs that provide direct tutor training and/or instruction using library staff, how many in each population service area have the following characteristics? [Note: 7 choices given having to do with focus and purposes of instruction and use being made of technology.]
LAPD5	What is the total amount of your state agency's fiscal 1995 funding for library literacy programs? (Or give the amount for the latest year available and specify the year.)
LAPD6	In the past 5 years has your state agency's funding of library-based adult literacy programs increased, decreased, or stayed about the same...as a percentage of your total agency budget? ...in dollar amount of support?
LAPD7	What criteria do you use to decide on the relative allocation of literacy funds to the central and branch libraries providing programs?
LAPD8	As best you can determine, what percentage of the state's 1995 funding for library literacy programs comes from the following sources? [Note: 9 choices given including Titles I and VI of LSCA.]
LAPD9	Please check any of the following services that your state agency or the state's central libraries provide for the benefit of individual library literacy programs. [8 choices given.]

Does your state library agency collect data on the library-based literacy programs in your state? (If yes, pls give best estmates to questions LAPD2-4. If not, go to question LAPD5.)

	Q2				Some Info Given		NCES Format?		LAPD1
	Yes	No	N.S.	N.R.	Yes	No	Yes	No	(2 only)
Alabama AL									
Alaska AK		1			1		1		
Arkansas AR		1			1		1		
Arizona AZ									
California CA	1				1		1		
Colorado CO				1	1			1	
Connecticut CT				1					
DC									
Delaware DE		1			1		1		
Florida FL	1				1		1		But can only provide best guesstimates.
Georgia GA	1				1		1		
Hawaii HI		1				1			
Iowa IA		1				1			
Idaho ID		1				1			
Illinois IL	1					1			Not NCES categories; too complicated to collect by deadline.
Indiana IN	1					1			Minimal summary info given.
Kansas KS		1				1			
Kentucky KY		1				1			Minimal info given.
Louisiana LA	1					1			
Massachusetts MA	1				1		1		
Maryland MD				1					
Maine ME		1				1			
Michigan MI		1				1			
Minnesota MN				1					
Missouri MO	1					1			Survey recently done; data not yet analyzed.
Mississippi MS		1				1			
Montana MT		1				1			
North Carolina NC									
North Dakota ND	1				1		1		
Nebraska NE		1				1			
New Hampshire NH	1				1		1		
New Jersey NJ		1				1			
New Mexico NM		1				1			
Nevada NV									
New York NY		1				1			
Ohio OH		1				1			Minimal info given.
Oklahoma OK		1			1		1		Libr Agency doesn't collect data, but I can provide some info.
Oregon OR		1				1			
Pennsylvania PA		1				1			
Rhode Island RI									
South Carolina SC		1				1			
South Dakota SD	1				1		1		
Tennessee TN		1				1			
Texas TX	1				1		1		
Utah UT									
Vermont VT		1				1			Minimal info given.
Virginia VA		1				1			
Washington WA	1				1		1		
West Virginia WV		1				1			
Wisconsin WI				1					
Wyoming WY		1				1			Minimal info given.
Totals	13	26	0	5	14	26	13	1	
% of Responds (39)	*33*	*67*							
% of Responds (40)					*35*	*65*			
% of Responds (14)							*93*	*7*	

LAPD2 There are about public libraries and library branches in your state. How many of them offered adult literacy services ap. 5 years ago and how many do today? If you do not have 1995 figures, please give the latest available and indicate the year. [Note: Services may include one or more of the following: provision of book collections for adult beginning readers; provision of print and/or computer learning materials; space for classes and other meetings; on-site tutor training ; on-site student instruction/classes; promotion, community referral, and other support activities.]

	5 years ago	In 1995
In areas serving populations of over 1,000,000	____	____
In areas of 500,000 to 999,999	____	____
In areas of 250,000 to 499,999	____	____
In areas of 100,000 to 249,999	____	____
In areas of 50,000 to 99,999	____	____
In areas of 25,000 to 49,999	____	____
In areas of 10,000 to 24,999	____	____
In areas of 5,000 to 9,999	____	____
In areas of 2,500 to 4,999	____	____
In areas of 1,000 to 2,499	____	____
In areas of less than 1,000	____	____

LAPD3. Of those libraries offering services in 1995, how many in each population group have the following characteristics:

1 # with an all-volunteer staff (i.e. no paid staff)
2 # with some paid staff (without regard to source of funding)
3 # providing book collections for adult beginning readers
4 # providing student and/or tutor learning materials (including materials for parents)
5 # providing space for classes and meetings
6 # providing information about illiteracy and/or referral services to outside groups
7 # providing direct tutor training and/or student instruction/classes using own staff
8 # using computer technology for literacy program management purposes

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
In areas serving populations of over 1,000,000	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____
In areas of 500,000 to 999,999	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____
In areas of 250,000 to 499,999	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____
In areas of 100,000 to 249,999	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____
In areas of 50,000 to 99,999	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____
In areas of 25,000 to 49,999	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____
In areas of 10,000 to 24,999	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____
In areas of 5,000 to 9,999	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____
In areas of 2,500 to 4,999	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____
In areas of 1,000 to 2,499	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____
In areas of less than 1,000	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____

LAPD4. Of those programs that provide direct tutor training and/or instruction using library staff, how many have the following characteristics:

a # with an ESL component
b # with a family literacy component (instruction focused on parents)
c # with a workforce/workplace component
d # with off-site instruction (e.g. in prisons, worksites, schools)
e # that collaborate with outside groups for instructional purposes
(e.g. voluntary organization, community college, public agency)
f # using computer technology for instruction/training purposes
g # using television or video cassette technology for instruction/training

	a	b	c	d	e	f	g
In areas serving populations of over 1,000,000							
In areas of 500,000 to 999,999							
In areas of 250,000 to 499,999							
In areas of 100,000 to 249,999							
In areas of 50,000 to 99,999							
In areas of 25,000 to 49,999							
In areas of 10,000 to 24,999							
In areas of 5,000 to 9,999							
In areas of 2,500 to 4,999							
In areas of 1,000 to 2,499							
In areas of less than 1,000							

LAPD 2. How many local public libraries and library branches in your state offered adult literacy serivces ap. 5 years ago and how many do today? If you do not have 1995 figures, please give the latest available and indicate the year.

LAPD 3. Of those libraries offering services in 1995, how many in each population group have the following characteristics?

1 - # with an all-volunteer staff
2 - # with some paid staff
3 - # providing book collections for adult beginning readers
4 - # providing learning materials for students and/or tutors
5 - # providing space for classes and meetings
6 - # providing information and referral services
7 - # providing direct tutor training and/or student instruction using library staff
8 - # using computer technology for literacy program management purposes

LAPD 4. Of those programs that provide direct tutor training and/or instruction using library staff, how many have the following characteristics?

a - # with an ESL component
b - # with a family literacy component (instruction focused on parents)
c - # with a workforce/workplace component
d - # with off-site instruction (e.g. in prisons, worksites, schools)
e - # that collaborate with outside groups for instructional purposes
(e.g. voluntary organizations, community colleges, public agencies)
f - # using computer technology for instruction/training purposes
g - # using television or video technology for instruction/training purposes

ALASKA

LAPD 2	5 years ago	In 1995	
In areas of over 1,000,000			
In areas of 500,000 to 999,999			
In areas of 250,000 to 499,999			
In areas of 100,000 to 249,999 (only 1 city this size)	1	0	(book collection)
In areas of 50,000 to 99,999 (only 1 city this size)	1	1	"
In areas of 25,000 to 49,999 (only 2 cities this size)	?	?	"
In areas of 10,000 to 24,999 (only 5 cities this size)	1	?	"
In areas of 5,000 to 9,999	?	?	"
In areas of 2,500 to 4,999	?	?	"
In areas of 1,000 to 2,499	?	?	
In areas of less than 1,000 (50% of all AK libraries)	0	0	(there are some with beginning readers)

LAPD 3:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
In areas of over 1,000,000									
In areas of 500,000 to 999,999									
In areas of 250,000 to 499,999									
In areas of 100,000 to 249,999									
In areas of 50,000 to 99,999		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	All info relates to the 1 library with an active program.
In areas of 25,000 to 49,999									
In areas of 10,000 to 24,999									
In areas of 5,000 to 9,999									
In areas of 2,500 to 4,999									
In areas of 1,000 to 2,499									
In areas of less than 1,000									

ALASKA cont'd

LAPD 4:	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	
In areas of over 1,000,000								
In areas of 500,000 to 999,999								
In areas of 250,000 to 499,999								
In areas of 100,000 to 249,999								
In areas of 50,000 to 99,999	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	Available in the collection, but not regularly used in the instructional program.
In areas of 25,000 to 49,999								
In areas of 10,000 to 24,999								
In areas of 5,000 to 9,999								
In areas of 2,500 to 4,999								
In areas of 1,000 to 2,499								
In areas of less than 1,000								

Only one community in the state has an active on-going literacy program. Many have a few beginning reader texts, some ESL materials, and if there are independent literacy programs patrons will be referred to them. The sole active library has relied on LSCA VI for the last 8 years and is not likely to survive if LSCA is eliminated.

ARKANSAS

LAPD 2	5 years ago	In 1994	
In areas of over 1,000,000			
In areas of 500,000 to 999,999			
In areas of 250,000 to 499,999		1	Headquarters
In areas of 100,000 to 249,999		2	"
In areas of 50,000 to 99,999		6	"
In areas of 25,000 to 49,999		3	"
In areas of 10,000 to 24,999		4	"
In areas of 5,000 to 9,999			
In areas of 2,500 to 4,999			
In areas of 1,000 to 2,499			
In areas of less than 1,000			
Totals			

LAPD 3:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
In areas of over 1,000,000								
In areas of 500,000 to 999,999								
In areas of 250,000 to 499,999		1	1			1		
In areas of 100,000 to 249,999	2		2			2		
In areas of 50,000 to 99,999	5	1	6		3	6		
In areas of 25,000 to 49,999	3		3			3		
In areas of 10,000 to 24,999	4		4		1	4		
In areas of 5,000 to 9,999								
In areas of 2,500 to 4,999								
In areas of 1,000 to 2,499								
In areas of less than 1,000								

LAPD 4:	a	b	c	d	e	f	g
In areas of over 1,000,000							
In areas of 500,000 to 999,999							
In areas of 250,000 to 499,999					1		
In areas of 100,000 to 249,999					2		
In areas of 50,000 to 99,999					6		
In areas of 25,000 to 49,999					3		
In areas of 10,000 to 24,999					4		
In areas of 5,000 to 9,999							
In areas of 2,500 to 4,999							
In areas of 1,000 to 2,499							
In areas of less than 1,000							

CALIFORNIA (reported in terms of library jurisdictions)

LAPD 2	5 years ago	In 1995
In areas of over 1,000,000	4	6
In areas of 500,000 to 999,999	7	6
In areas of 250,000 to 499,999	7	8
In areas of 100,000 to 249,999	22	23
In areas of 50,000 to 99,999	18	30
In areas of 25,000 to 49,999	13	18
In areas of 10,000 to 24,999	8	14
In areas of 5,000 to 9,999	1	0
In areas of 2,500 to 4,999	0	0
In areas of 1,000 to 2,499	0	0
In areas of less than 1,000	0	0

[Note: Some population areas have increased and thus been recategorized in 1995.]

LAPD 3:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
In areas of over 1,000,000	0	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
In areas of 500,000 to 999,999	0	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
In areas of 250,000 to 499,999	0	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
In areas of 100,000 to 249,999	1	22	23	23	23	23	22	22
In areas of 50,000 to 99,999	3	27	30	30	30	30	27	27
In areas of 25,000 to 49,999	3	15	18	18	18	18	15	15
In areas of 10,000 to 24,999	3	11	14	14	14	14	11	11
In areas of 5,000 to 9,999	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
In areas of 2,500 to 4,999	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
In areas of 1,000 to 2,499	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
In areas of less than 1,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

LAPD 4:	a	b	c	d	e	f	g
In areas of over 1,000,000	1	5	1	6	6	3	4
In areas of 500,000 to 999,999	1	5	1	6	6	0	1
In areas of 250,000 to 499,999	1	5	3	8	8	2	3
In areas of 100,000 to 249,999	6	10	6	22	22	8	7
In areas of 50,000 to 99,999	5	11	6	27	27	8	8
In areas of 25,000 to 49,999	5	11	3	15	15	2	5
In areas of 10,000 to 24,999	3	11	4	9	9	0	3
In areas of 5,000 to 9,999	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
In areas of 2,500 to 4,999	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
In areas of 1,000 to 2,499	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
In areas of less than 1,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

COLORADO

LAPD 2	5 years ago	In 1995
Totals	13	16

LAPD 3:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Totals		16	16				16	10

LAPD 4:	a	b	c	d	e	f	g
Totals	3	7	1		10		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DELAWARE

LAPD 2	5 years ago	In 1995
In areas of over 1,000,000		
In areas of 500,000 to 999,999		
In areas of 250,000 to 499,999		
In areas of 100,000 to 249,999	1	2
In areas of 50,000 to 99,999	1	1
In areas of 25,000 to 49,999	1	
In areas of 10,000 to 24,999		
In areas of 5,000 to 9,999	1	
In areas of 2,500 to 4,999		1
In areas of 1,000 to 2,499		
In areas of less than 1,000		

LAPD 3:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
In areas of over 1,000,000								
In areas of 500,000 to 999,999								
In areas of 250,000 to 499,999								
In areas of 100,000 to 249,999		2	2	2	2	2	2	1
In areas of 50,000 to 99,999		1	1	1	1	1	1	
In areas of 25,000 to 49,999								
In areas of 10,000 to 24,999								
In areas of 5,000 to 9,999								
In areas of 2,500 to 4,999		1	1	1	1	1	1	
In areas of 1,000 to 2,499								
In areas of less than 1,000								

FLORIDA

LAPD 2:	5 years ago	In 1995
In areas of over 1,000,000	65	65
In areas of 500,000 to 999,999	80	84
In areas of 250,000 to 499,999	69	69
In areas of 100,000 to 249,999	91	90
In areas of 50,000 to 99,999	41	42
In areas of 25,000 to 49,999	26	28
In areas of 10,000 to 24,999	19	19
In areas of 5,000 to 9,999	10	10
In areas of 2,500 to 4,999	4	4
In areas of 1,000 to 2,499	0	0
In areas of less than 1,000	0	0

LAPD 3:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
In areas of over 1,000,000	0	65	65	65	65	65	65	65
In areas of 500,000 to 999,999	0	84	84	84	84	84	31	70*
In areas of 250,000 to 499,999	0	69	69	69	69	69	20*	60*
In areas of 100,000 to 249,999	0	90	90	90	90	90	20*	79*
In areas of 50,000 to 99,999	0	22	42	42	42	42	10*	15*
In areas of 25,000 to 49,999	5*	16	28	28	28	28	8*	12*
In areas of 10,000 to 24,999	10*	9	19	19	19	19	5*	8*
In areas of 5,000 to 9,999	8*	2	10	8	10	10	2*	2*
In areas of 2,500 to 4,999								
In areas of 1,000 to 2,499								
In areas of less than 1,000								

* approximate

FLORIDA, cont'd

LAPD 4:	a	b	c	d	e	f	g
In areas of over 1,000,000	65	35	65	30*	65	15*	0
In areas of 500,000 to 999,999							
In areas of 250,000 to 499,999							
In areas of 100,000 to 249,999							
In areas of 50,000 to 99,999							
In areas of 25,000 to 49,999							
In areas of 10,000 to 24,999							
In areas of 5,000 to 9,999							
In areas of 2,500 to 4,999							
In areas of 1,000 to 2,499							
In areas of less than 1,000							

* approximate

Note: We do not collect specific data to be able to respond accurately to this question. The best I could do would be to guesstimate, and then I do not feel that what I provide will reflect the level of service that exists in Florida public libraries. For example, let's take Broward County, which has one of the longest running, strongest literacy programs in Florida. The program has a paid full-time literacy staff of approximately 8-10, with additional part-time staff, a host of trained volunteers who provide program support other than tutoring, etc., and the system has 34 libraries, including the main library. Space is made available in each.

GEORGIA (data reported according to systems)

LAPD 2	5 years ago	In 1995
In areas of over 1,000,000		0
In areas of 500,000 to 999,999		3
In areas of 250,000 to 499,999		1
In areas of 100,000 to 249,999		7
In areas of 50,000 to 99,999		5
In areas of 25,000 to 49,999		4
In areas of 10,000 to 24,999		6
In areas of 5,000 to 9,999		
In areas of 2,500 to 4,999		
In areas of 1,000 to 2,499		
In areas of less than 1,000		

LAPD 3:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
In areas of over 1,000,000								
In areas of 500,000 to 999,999	0	3	3	3	3	3	3	2
In areas of 250,000 to 499,999	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
In areas of 100,000 to 249,999	0	7	3	3	7	7	4	6
In areas of 50,000 to 99,999	0	5	3	3	5	5	3	4
In areas of 25,000 to 49,999	1	3	3	3	3	4	3	1
In areas of 10,000 to 24,999	1	5	4	4	5	6	5	4
In areas of 5,000 to 9,999								
In areas of 2,500 to 4,999								
In areas of 1,000 to 2,499								
In areas of less than 1,000								

GEORGIA, cont'd

LAPD 4:	a	b	c	d	e	f	g
In areas of over 1,000,000							
In areas of 500,000 to 999,999	2	3			1	2	
In areas of 250,000 to 499,999	1	1			0	1	
In areas of 100,000 to 249,999	4	7			4	4	
In areas of 50,000 to 99,999	4	5			3	3	
In areas of 25,000 to 49,999	4	4			3	1	
In areas of 10,000 to 24,999	5	6			5	3	
In areas of 5,000 to 9,999							
In areas of 2,500 to 4,999							
In areas of 1,000 to 2,499							
In areas of less than 1,000							

MASSACHUSETTS

LAPD 2	5 years ago	In 1995
In areas of over 1,000,000		
In areas of 500,000 to 999,999		
In areas of 250,000 to 499,999		
In areas of 100,000 to 249,999	2	2
In areas of 50,000 to 99,999	10	12
In areas of 25,000 to 49,999	17	14
In areas of 10,000 to 24,999	9	7
In areas of 5,000 to 9,999	1	1
In areas of 2,500 to 4,999	2	2
In areas of 1,000 to 2,499	1	1
In areas of less than 1,000	1	1

LAPD 3:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
In areas of over 1,000,000								
In areas of 500,000 to 999,999								
In areas of 250,000 to 499,999								
In areas of 100,000 to 249,999		2	2	2	2	2	2	2
In areas of 50,000 to 99,999		12	12	12	12	12	12	9
In areas of 25,000 to 49,999		14	14	14	14	14	14	8
In areas of 10,000 to 24,999		7	7	7	7	7	7	2
In areas of 5,000 to 9,999		1	1	1	1	1	1	0
In areas of 2,500 to 4,999		2	2	2	2	2	0	0
In areas of 1,000 to 2,499		1	1	1	0	0	0	0
In areas of less than 1,000			1	1	0	0	0	0

These stats are ONLY for instructional programs

LAPD 4:	a	b	c	d	e	f	g
In areas of over 1,000,000							
In areas of 500,000 to 999,999							
In areas of 250,000 to 499,999							
In areas of 100,000 to 249,999	2	2	1	1	2	2	2
In areas of 50,000 to 99,999	12	8	4	1	12	9	9
In areas of 25,000 to 49,999	14	2		3	14	8	8
In areas of 10,000 to 24,999	7				7	2	2
In areas of 5,000 to 9,999	1				1		
In areas of 2,500 to 4,999	2				2		
In areas of 1,000 to 2,499	1				1		
In areas of less than 1,000	1				1		

NORTH DAKOTA

LAPD 2		5 years ago	In 1995
In areas of over 1,000,000	na		
In areas of 500,000 to 999,999	na		
In areas of 250,000 to 499,999	na		
In areas of 100,000 to 249,999	na		
In areas of 50,000 to 99,999		2	2
In areas of 25,000 to 49,999		0	0
In areas of 10,000 to 24,999		0	1
In areas of 5,000 to 9,999		0	2
In areas of 2,500 to 4,999		0	1
In areas of 1,000 to 2,499		0	5
In areas of less than 1,000			

LAPD 3:		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
In areas of over 1,000,000	na								
In areas of 500,000 to 999,999	na								
In areas of 250,000 to 499,999	na								
In areas of 100,000 to 249,999	na								
In areas of 50,000 to 99,999				2	2	2	2	1	0
In areas of 25,000 to 49,999				0	0	0	0	0	0
In areas of 10,000 to 24,999				1	1	1	1	0	0
In areas of 5,000 to 9,999				2	2	2	2	0	0
In areas of 2,500 to 4,999				1	1	1	1	0	0
In areas of 1,000 to 2,499			5	5	5	5	5	0	0
In areas of less than 1,000									

LAPD 4:		a	b	c	d	e	f	g
In areas of over 1,000,000	na							
In areas of 500,000 to 999,999	na							
In areas of 250,000 to 499,999	na							
In areas of 100,000 to 249,999	na							
In areas of 50,000 to 99,999		0	0	0	2	2	1	0
In areas of 25,000 to 49,999		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
In areas of 10,000 to 24,999		0	0	0	0	1	0	0
In areas of 5,000 to 9,999		0	0	0	0	2	0	0
In areas of 2,500 to 4,999		0	0	0	0	1	0	0
In areas of 1,000 to 2,499		0	0	0	0	5	0	0
In areas of less than 1,000		0	0	0	0	0	0	0

NEW HAMPSHIRE

LAPD 2		5 years ago	In 1995
In areas of over 1,000,000	na		
In areas of 500,000 to 999,999	na		
In areas of 250,000 to 499,999	na		
In areas of 100,000 to 249,999	na		
In areas of 50,000 to 99,999		0	1
In areas of 25,000 to 49,999		1	3
In areas of 10,000 to 24,999		2	7
In areas of 5,000 to 9,999		2	7
In areas of 2,500 to 4,999		1	10
In areas of 1,000 to 2,499		2	5
In areas of less than 1,000		0	1

NEW HAMPSHIRE, cont'd

LAPD 3:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
In areas of over 1,000,000	na							
In areas of 500,000 to 999,999								
In areas of 250,000 to 499,999	na							
In areas of 100,000 to 249,999	na							
In areas of 50,000 to 99,999		1	1	1	1	1		
In areas of 25,000 to 49,999	2	1	3	3	3	3	1	1
In areas of 10,000 to 24,999	8	0	8	8	8	8	0	0
In areas of 5,000 to 9,999	6	1	7	7	7	7	1	1
In areas of 2,500 to 4,999	8	2	10	10	10	10	2	2
In areas of 1,000 to 2,499	4	1	5	5	5	5	0	1
In areas of less than 1,000	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0

LAPD 4:	a	b	c	d	e	f	g
In areas of over 1,000,000	na						
In areas of 500,000 to 999,999	na						
In areas of 250,000 to 499,999	na						
In areas of 100,000 to 249,999	na						
In areas of 50,000 to 99,999	1	0	0	0	1	0	1
In areas of 25,000 to 49,999	1	0	0	0	1	1	1
In areas of 10,000 to 24,999	na						
In areas of 5,000 to 9,999	1	0	0	0	1	1	1
In areas of 2,500 to 4,999	2	1	0	0	2	2	2
In areas of 1,000 to 2,499	na						
In areas of less than 1,000	0	1	0	0	1	0	0

OKLAHOMA

LAPD 2	5 years ago	In 1995
In areas of over 1,000,000		0
In areas of 500,000 to 999,999		2*
In areas of 250,000 to 499,999		1*
In areas of 100,000 to 249,999		2*
In areas of 50,000 to 99,999		3*
In areas of 25,000 to 49,999		3*
In areas of 10,000 to 24,999		13
In areas of 5,000 to 9,999		10
In areas of 2,500 to 4,999		8
In areas of 1,000 to 2,499		1
In areas of less than 1,000		1

*Systems. The numbers are the same for 1990 and 1995.

LAPD 3:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
In areas of over 1,000,000								
In areas of 500,000 to 999,999	1	1	2	2	2	2	1	2
In areas of 250,000 to 499,999		1	1	1	1	1	1	1
In areas of 100,000 to 249,999		2	2	2	2	2	0	0
In areas of 50,000 to 99,999		2	2	2	2	2	0	0
In areas of 25,000 to 49,999		1	1	1	1	1	1	0
In areas of 10,000 to 24,999	9	4	13	13	8	3	2	1
In areas of 5,000 to 9,999	0	0	6	6	3	10	0	0
In areas of 2,500 to 4,999	0	0	3	3	3	8	0	0
In areas of 1,000 to 2,499	4	0	2	2	1	4	0	0
In areas of less than 1,000								

OKLAHOMA, cont'd

LAPD 4:	a	b	c	d	e	f	g
In areas of over 1,000,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
In areas of 500,000 to 999,999	0	1	1	1	1	1	1
In areas of 250,000 to 499,999	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
In areas of 100,000 to 249,999	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
In areas of 50,000 to 99,999	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
In areas of 25,000 to 49,999	0	1	0	0	1	0	1
In areas of 10,000 to 24,999	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
In areas of 5,000 to 9,999							
In areas of 2,500 to 4,999							
In areas of 1,000 to 2,499							
In areas of less than 1,000							

SOUTH DAKOTA

LAPD 2:	5 years ago	In 1995
In areas of over 1,000,000	n.a.	n.a.
In areas of 500,000 to 999,999	n.a.	n.a.
In areas of 250,000 to 499,999	n.a.	n.a.
In areas of 100,000 to 249,999	n.a.	n.a.
In areas of 50,000 to 99,999	2	2
In areas of 25,000 to 49,999	2	2
In areas of 10,000 to 24,999	6	6
In areas of 5,000 to 9,999	4	4
In areas of 2,500 to 4,999	1	1
In areas of 1,000 to 2,499	1	1
In areas of less than 1,000	0	0

LAPD 3:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
In areas of over 1,000,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
In areas of 500,000-999,999	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
In areas of 250,000 to 499,999	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
In areas of 100,000 to 249,999	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
In areas of 50,000 to 99,999	2	0	2	2	2	2	0	0
In areas of 25,000 to 49,999	2	0	2	2	1	2	0	0
In areas of 10,000 to 24,999	6	0	6	6	4	6	0	0
In areas of 5,000 to 9,999	4	0	4	4	4	4	0	0
In areas of 2,500 to 4,999	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0
In areas of 1,000 to 2,499	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0
In areas of less than 1,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

TEXAS

LAPD 2:	1990	In 1994
In areas of 1,000,000 or more	1	4
In areas of 500,000-999,999	3	1
In areas of 250,000 to 499,999	3	3
In areas of 100,000 to 249,999	13	16
In areas of 50,000 to 99,999	12	12
In areas of 25,000 to 49,999	32	27
In areas of 10,000 to 24,999	45	45
In areas of 5,000 to 9,999	44	37
In areas of 2,500 to 4,999	25	15
In areas of 1,000 to 2,499	11	2
In areas of less than 1,000	2	1

TEXAS, cont'd

LAPD 3 (1994):	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
In areas of over 1,000,000	0	4	n.	na	na	na	4	na
In areas of 500,000-999,999	0	1					1	
In areas of 250,000 to 499,999	0	4					3	
In areas of 100,000 to 249,999	0	20					16	
In areas of 50,000 to 99,999	0	24					12	
In areas of 25,000 to 49,999	0	46					27	
In areas of 10,000 to 24,999	2	101					45	
In areas of 5,000 to 9,999	2	108					37	
In areas of 2,500 to 4,999	3	104					15	
In areas of 1,000 to 2,499	4	63					2	
In areas of less than 1,000	1	13					1	

LAPD 4:	a	b	c	d	e	f	g
In areas of over 1,000,000	4	2	0	na	na	na	na
In areas of 500,000-999,999	1	1	1				
In areas of 250,000 to 499,999	1	2	1				
In areas of 100,000 to 249,999	7	4	2				
In areas of 50,000 to 99,999	6	2	2				
In areas of 25,000 to 49,999	15	6	2				
In areas of 10,000 to 24,999	21	5	5				
In areas of 5,000 to 9,999	12	2	2				
In areas of 2,500 to 4,999	20	9	3				
In areas of 1,000 to 2,499	7	4	4				
In areas of less than 1,000	0	1	0				

WASHINGTON

APD 2	5 years ago	In 1995
In areas of over 1,000,000		
In areas of 500,000 to 999,999		
In areas of 250,000 to 499,999		85
In areas of 100,000 to 249,999		60
In areas of 50,000 to 99,999		20
In areas of 25,000 to 49,999		
In areas of 10,000 to 24,999		10
In areas of 5,000 to 9,999		
In areas of 2,500 to 4,999		5
In areas of 1,000 to 2,499		
In areas of less than 1,000		

Totals

LAPD 3:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
In areas of over 1,000,000								
In areas of 500,000 to 999,999								
In areas of 250,000 to 499,999			60		85	108	2	
In areas of 100,000 to 249,999			28		27	80	2	
In areas of 50,000 to 99,999			20		15	24	1	
In areas of 25,000 to 49,999								
In areas of 10,000 to 24,999			7		15	20	0	
In areas of 5,000 to 9,999								
In areas of 2,500 to 4,999			5		29	7	0	
In areas of 1,000 to 2,499								
In areas of less than 1,000								

What is the total amount of the State Library's FY95 funding for library literacy programs? LAPD5

In past 5 years has the State Library's adult literacy funding increased, decreased, or stayed about the same? LAPD6 (2 only)

		In past 5 year, literacy funding				In past 5 yrs, literacy funding				
		As % of total budget				In dollar amount				
	Agency's FY 95 funding	Incr	Decr	SAS	N.R.	Incr	Decr	SAS	N.R.	
Alabama AL										
Alaska AK	0			1				1		
Arkansas AR	35,000		1					1		LSCA Title VI
Arizona AZ										
California CA	3,466,000			1				1		FY year ended 6/96.
Colorado CO	? Minimal		1				1			All federal grants
Connecticut CT	N.R.				1				1	
DC										
Delaware DE	4147			1				1		
Florida FL	25,000		1				1			
Georgia GA	0		1				1			LSCA Title I
Hawaii HI	187,575				1				1	LAPD6=N.R.
Iowa IA	0		1				1			
Idaho ID	0		1				1			
Illinois IL	6,000,000			1		1				Agency is entire Sec. of State Lit. Office
Indiana IN	341,831		1				1			
Kansas KS	277,000		1				1			
Kentucky KY	39,130			1				1		
Louisiana LA	0			1				1		
Massachusetts MA	60,000			1				1		We do not provide direct funding only outside LSCA.
Maryland MD	N.R.		1						1	
Maine ME	0		1				1			
Michigan MI	17,381		1				1			
Minnesota MN	N.R.				1				1	
Missouri MO	18,257	1						1		
Mississippi MS	10,116			1				1		
Montana MT	61,000				1				1	35M LSCA Title VI; 26M SLRC
North Carolina NC										
North Dakota ND	0		1				1			
Nebraska NE	0		1						1	
New Hampshire NH	0			1				1		
New Jersey NJ	100,000			1				1		
New Mexico NM	70,000			1				1		350M supports NMCoalition for Lit w/200M
Nevada NV										subgrantd to loc pgms, 70M to libr-based pgms
New York NY	385,000			1				1		185M state grant; ap. 200M LSCA
Ohio OH	5,400				1		1			Down from 55M in 1991 and 116M high in 1989.
Oklahoma OK	152,781			1				1		Plus SLRC @ ap.100M
Oregon OR	34,992	1				1				FY94 LSCA Title VI;w/end of LSCA will decrease.
Pennsylvania PA	0			1				1		
Rhode Island RI										
South Carolina SC	0		1				1			
South Dakota SD	15,000			1				1		
Tennessee TN	64,154			1				1		
Texas TX	359,874			1				1		Funds allocated to 10 libr systems to
Utah UT										disburse; includes ESL.
Vermont VT	0			1				1		
Virginia VA	0		1				1			
Washington WA	N.R.			1				1		
West Virginia WV	0			1				1		
Wisconsin WI	N.R.				1				1	
Wyoming WY	0				1				1	
Totals	$11,729,638	2	15	20	7	2	13	21	8	
					44				44	
% of Responds (37)		5	41	54						
% of Responds (36)						6	36	58		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

If the State Library agency provides literacy funding to the central and branch libraries, what criteria are used to decide on the relative allocations?

LAPD7

State Library Literacy Contacts

Arkansas AR	LSCA Title I - criteria for literacy subgrants for public libraries is the same as for any other LSCA Title I subgrant. LSCA Title VI - criteria for participation (1) illiteracy rate, (2) geographic location in state, and (3) library cooperation with other established area literacy providers.
California CA	Our funding is to the local library jurisdictions. They decide which branches to include.
Colorado CO	For LSCA, there is an RFP process. Although I have no say in final decision, I do [make recommendations].
Delaware DE	Grant process.
Florida FL	We have never turned down a library's request for LSCA grant funds unless that library's request exceeded the 4-year limit that we currently use to fund any one project or unless the proposal was absolutely unsalvageable. We primarily look at the percentage of the total adult population that has not completed high school; number of adults who do not speak English well or at all; method of service delivery; education/training experience of project staff; costs of services proposed by specific budget category; quality of objectives and activities; evaluation plan; etc.
Georgia GA	It depends on the number of libraries submitting applications and the grant program area in which they apply.
Hawaii HI	N.R.
Illinois IL	Our literacy funds are allocated on a community basis. If the library is the best agency to coordinate literacy efforts within a community or neighborhood they become the fiscal agent. They are involved as required partners in all projects. The Literacy Advisory Board has also determined that we should put large resources into communities whose residents are disproportionately represented in the two lower literacy levels--the Hispanic and African American population.
Indiana IN	Program applications judged on merit.
Kansas KS	The need, program objectives, methods, evaluation, and future funding capabilities.
Kentucky KY	One statewide program administers competitive subgrants.

Massachusetts MA	A competitive grant round is run every year in all LSCA projects which include literacy & ESL. This changes based on community need, interest and ability to write and carry-out a proposal. This is SEED money to begin new services; it cannot be used for ongoing expenses.
Michigan MI	LSCA competitive grant program.
Missouri MO	We have an LSCA competitive grants committee that makes the decisions on allocations of all LSCA funds.
Mississippi MS	Is there a need? Will the dollars make a difference? Will impact justify the project? How will output be measured?
Montana MT	N.A.
New Jersey NJ	There are 3 programs: Literacy Instruction, Literacy Collection Development, and Family Literacy. Libraries can submit applications for any or all programs simultaneously. The money is distributed by rank scoring, regardless of program.
New Mexico NM	The quality of their proposed projects in the universe of literacy program applicants (# of individuals likely to be assisted, use of volunteers, etc.).
New York NY	Awards based solely on grant applications.
Ohio OH	Monies are available through LSCA. We use a NOTICE OF INTENT process which allows the applicant to request what they need. In this next year we only have one library applying.
Oklahoma OK	They apply through a competitive grant process similar to the LSCA Title VI grant application (but easier). The highest scoring applications are funded.
Oregon OR	No allocation program. LSCA Title I competitive grants have evaluation criteria that must be highly scored.
Pennsylvania PA	Dependent on applications submitted under a competitive grant process.
South Carolina SC	Grant application.
South Dakota SD	Financial need - "mini grant" requests.
Tennessee TN	Competitive proposals for use of funds.

Texas TX	The library systems determine the allocation of literacy funds to the member libraries based on plans of service.
Washington WA	Funds are distributed purely on the quality of grant proposals submitted to the State Library. Any public library in the state can apply with any literacy idea.

What percentage of the state's 1995 funding for library literacy programs comes from the following sources?											LAPD 8
											(2 only)
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		1 = LSCA Title VI
Alabama AL											2 = LSCA Title I
Alaska AK	100									In-kind contr last year totaled over $5000.	3 = Other fedl $
Arkansas AR	100										4 = State sources
Arizona AZ											5 = Municipal sources
California CA	12	2	4	29	42	1	1	2	8	3,4=multiple incl ABE, GAIN; 5=municipal/county	6 = Corporate grants
Colorado CO	65	5			20	4	3	3			7 = Foundation grants
Connecticut CT										N.R.	8 = Individual donations
DC											9 = Other
Delaware DE				100							
Florida FL	10	5	8	20	50	3	2	2			
Georgia GA										N.R. - We do not collect this information.	
Hawaii HI	27		36	37						3=PMRIS & SLRC	
Iowa IA										Don't know	
Idaho ID	90						5	5			
Illinois IL	1	1	30	60			8			3=5%workplace, 25%ABE; 4=genl rev, SBE, SOS	
Indiana IN	81	19								But corp, fndtn, indiv unknown.	
Kansas KS				5		5	10		80	5=SED, 9=lottery ticket sales	
Kentucky KY	20	15					65				
Louisiana LA	95	5									
Massachusetts MA										Information seriously incomplete.	
Maryland MD										N.R.	
Maine ME										N.R.	
Michigan MI										Don't know	
Minnesota MN										N.R.	
Missouri MO	90						5		5	9=local literacy councils	
Mississippi MS		100									
Montana MT	57		43							3=SLRC funds	
North Carolina NC											
North Dakota ND	25			25				50		4=Adult Ed	
Nebraska NE										N.R.	
New Hampshire NH	95					5					
New Jersey NJ		100									
New Mexico NM	40			50	5			5			
Nevada NV											
New York NY										Don't know (can't determine)	
Ohio OH										Not available; no time to survey libraries for info.	
Oklahoma OK	23	14	45	17					1	Does not include Resource Center.	
Oregon OR	30				50	10	10				
Pennsylvania PA	6			90				4		Info not tracked by state library agency.	
Rhode Island RI											
South Carolina SC										Info not available.	
South Dakota SD		5	75	5				15		3=Resource Center funding.	
Tennessee TN		100									
Texas TX										Information unusable.	
Utah UT											
Vermont VT	100									VT Ctr for Book also receives NEH, Fndtn grants.	
Virginia VA										n/a	
Washington WA	50	15		5	21	5	2	2		A big guess!	
West Virginia WV	100										
Wisconsin WI	5	35		30	30						
Wyoming WY										n/a	
	1,221	421	241	473	218	33	111	88	94	2900=100%	
National Avg in %	42.1	14.5	8.3	16.3	7.5	1.1	3.8	3	3.2		

Note: Due to rounding figures may not total to 100%.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Please check any of the following services that your state agency or the state's central libraries provide for the benefit of local library literacy programs.

	1. State Advocacy		2. National Advocacy		3. Policy Dev & Planning		4. Statewide or Regional Conferencing		5. Prof Staff Dev		6. Eval,Pgm Dev, Other Tech Asst		7. Data Collection & Analysis		8. Other		LAPD 9 (2 only)
	SA	CL	SA	CL	SA	CL	SA	CL	SA	CL	SA	CL	SA	CL	SA	CL	
Alabama AL																	
Alaska AK																	n/a
Arkansas AR	1	1	1														
Arizona AZ																	
California CA	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1			
Colorado CO	1		1		1				1		1		1		1		Wide range tech assistance!
Connecticut CT																	N.R.
DC																	
Delaware DE	1																
Florida FL	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1			
Georgia GA	1										1		1				
Hawaii HI																	N.R.
Iowa IA		1		1		1		1		1		1					
Idaho ID	1										1				1		
Illinois IL	1		1		1		1		1		1		1				Other=Info dissemination, collaboration
Indiana IN	1	1	1		1	1	1	1			1						
Kansas KS	1		1		1		1		1		1						
Kentucky KY	1		1		1		1		1		1						
Louisiana LA	1	1	1		1		1		1		1						
Massachusetts MA	1		1		1		1		1		1		1				Write proposals as demo projects, w/ pub libr as sites.
Maryland MD																	N.R.
Maine ME															1		We sometimes sponsor workshops for librarians on how
Michigan MI																	N.R. /to develop local literacy support pgms
Minnesota MN																	N.R.
Missouri MO	1						1		1		1		1				
Mississippi MS	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1		SA Other=supply grant info;CL 4-5 consistently
Montana MT							1										Through SLRC
North Carolina NC																	
North Dakota ND	1	1	1			1	1			1	1	1		1			
Nebraska NE	1																
New Hampshire NH	1		1				1				1						
New Jersey NJ																	N.R.
New Mexico NM																	N.R.
Nevada NV																	
New York NY	1	1	1	1													
Ohio OH	1				1				1		1						CL=Not known.
Oklahoma OK	1		1		1		1		1		1		1		1		Scholarships, lending library, minigrants, etc.
Oregon OR	1	1	1	1	1	1	1								1		Periodic=work to renew library role in literacy
Pennsylvania PA	1				1				1								
Rhode Island RI																	
South Carolina SC	1		1						1						1		Other=resource collection print & nonprint.
South Dakota SD					1		1		1				1				
Tennessee TN	1		1		1		1		1		1		1				
Texas TX		1		1		1		1		1		1		1			
Utah UT																	
Vermont VT	1	1			1	1	1	1	1		1						
Virginia VA	1		1												1		
Washington WA	1	1		1	1				1				1				
West Virginia WV															1		Grant writing & consulting asst as needed.
Wisconsin WI	1						1		1				1				
Wyoming WY																	None
SA Totals	29		19		18		19		19		19		12		9		
% of Responds(36)	*81*		*53*		*50*		*53*		*53*		*53*		*33*		*25*		
CL Totals		13		8		8		7		6		6		5		0	
% of Responds (36)		*36*		*22*		*22*		*19*		*17*		*17*		*14*		*0*	

CONTENTS:
7. About Your Library Literacy Program (Q4 only)

LP1 Please describe briefly your program's overall purposes and goals.

LP2 Indicate the makeup by % of your adult student body--by age, ethnicity/race, gender, whether employed, whether on public assistance, and other key demographic variables you consider important.

LP3 How many years has your program been in operation?

LP4 How long have you been in your present position?

LP5 Please indicate the size of your program with respect to the following indicators: # full-time staff, # part-time staff, #paid staff, # volunteers, # of students being served, operating budget for FY95/96.

LP6 What are your principal sources of funding (check all that apply, giving relative percentages if you can). [Note: 8 choices given.]

LP7 The National Center for Education Statistics and many state library agencies collect data according to the following public library service area categories. In which size population area is your program located (please circle one)?

LP8 Which of the following are regular services/features of your library literacy program (check all that apply)? [Note: 6 choices given.]

LP9 If your program provides its own tutor training and/or instruction, which of the following components does the instructional program have (check all that apply)? [Note: 11 choices.]

LP10 If your program provides direct tutor training and/or instruction, please indicate the basic educational philosophy that guides it, indicating the curricular and instructional approach taken (e.g. whole language, phonics).

LP11 If your program provides its own instruction and/or tutor training services, what percentage of the instructional/training personnel are: externally-recruited ABE professionals and/ or volunteer tutors; librarians?

LP12 Please check any of the following services (16 given) that your program regularly receives from these four sources: state library agency, local or regional library, state or regional literacy resource center, other entity.

LP13 What are the 2-3 greatest barriers to effecive service in your program and in the extent and nature of its outreach? What local, state, or national assistance not now provided might help you overcome these barriers?

Alabama AL

We provide one-on-one tutoring to adults over 19 years old who live in Calhoun County. Free lessons in reading and writing and free materials, free training to literacy tutors but ask that they volunteer 50 hours back into the program. (LVA Anniston Calhoun County, Anniston/Calhoun County Public Library)

Arkansas AR

Reading education and literacy (REAL) is a program in Hot Spring County Library. REAL will recruit and train tutors for an adult literacy program and for peer tutoring in county school districts. The goal of REAL is to reduce the rate of illiteracy in adults and children by offering volunteer services of tutoring 1-on-1. Cooperation between agencies and organizations will be nurtured. Volunteerism of people and organizations will be promoted. Library materials, consumable and collection, are purchased. Information will be disseminated on literacy statistics and the REAL program. (Literacy Council of Hot Spring County, Hot Spring County Library)

To assist each person enrolled in the program to reach his/her fullest potential toward becoming a self-sufficient person in terms of decision making, securing employment, providing stable family settings and making worthwhile contributions to the community. (AR River Valley Libraries for Literacy - Reading Together, AR River Valley Regional Library)

California CA

Provide ESL instruction using volunteer tutors, provide materials collections for basic literacy and ESL, provide reference and referral services, advocate and promote community awareness, offer self-education opportunity through audio/videotapes and computers.
(Adult Literacy Program-Project Upgrade, Napa City County Library)

Provide learner-centered reading and writing help to English speaking adults and families through library programs. We provide 1:1 and small group tutoring, tutor training, materials, computer-assisted instruction, family workshops, and pre-reading activities for young children. We have programs in 8 libraries of the County and also work with incarcerated adults in the Alameda County jail system. (Adult Literacy Program, Alameda County Library, Fremont)

Partners in Reading enables English-speaking adults to improve their basic literacy skills so they may function more effectively on the job and in society, achieve their goals, and develop their knowledge and potential. Through learner/tutor partnerships, our program uses a variety of methods designed to meet individual learning needs. As a library literacy program, Partners in Reading helps learners acquire skills that enable them to use the services of public libraries more effectively. (Partners in Reading, San Jose Public Library)

Our adult literacy program serves adults aged 16 and over who wish to improve their basic reading, writing, and math skills. Trained volunteers tutor adults in one-to-one or small group settings. Our goal is to help at least 60 students per year move toward their various goals.
(Commerce Public Library Adult Literacy Program)

California CA (cont'd)	Provide reading, writing, and communication skills for adult students to enable them to achieve their goals on the job and in society. 1. Maintain a literacy curriculum based on learner-centered goals. 2. Train and support volunteer tutors. 3. Match tutors and learners one-on-one or small groups. 4. Empower parents to become child's first teacher. 5. Provide materials for diverse literacy needs. Develop cross-cultural awareness that creates sense of community. (LVA Marin County, San Rafael Public Library)
Colorado CO	The Mesa County Public Library District Adult Reading Program provides free, confidential, individualized reading and writing instruction for adults 16 years of age or older, not enrolled in a regular school program and reading below the 6th grade level. Trained volunteer tutors throughout the county meet at 35 public places with private meeting space at various times of the day or evening to meet the student's schedule. (Literacy Program, Mesa County Public Library District)
Connecticut CT	Provide family literacy programs to caregivers of young children. Provide basic literacy and ESL training to adults. (LVA-Greater Waterbury, Silas Bronson Library)
Delaware DE	Project READS' goal is to help reduce and eventually eliminate adult illiteracy among residents of Sussex County. Its goal is to help increase literacy skills of Sussex County residents by providing basic reading skills training. (Project Reads: Sussex County Literacy Council, Sussex County Department of Libraries) LVA/WLA provides free one-to-one tutoring for adults in basic reading and conversational English skills. The student/tutor team meet twice a week at a time and place convenient for both. A computer lab, an Adult Literacy Learning Center, and family literacy are also provided. (LVA-Wilmington Library).
Florida FL	Project LEAD has a mission to reach adult learners who speak English, but read below a 3rd-grade level, and bring them up to 5th-grade reading level. At that time, they are referred to the County Adult Education classes to go on and get their GED. (Project LEAD, Miami-Dade Public Library System) Our program is 1/2 family literacy in-house and 1/2 outreach to find one-to-one tutors and students. (Panhandle Library Literacy Consortium, Jefferson County Public Library) Provides 1:1 tutoring in basic literacy and ESL. (Hillsborough Literacy Council, Tampa-Hillsborough County Library System) Our goal is to assist any resident of our County in reaching his/her personal educational goals. (Literacy Program, Brevard County Library) Serving the needs of individuals and families in our community by creating, promoting and implementing environments and tools which support the lifelong learning goals of our patrons, including access to our print and databased materials. These book-based learning services, materials,and tools will be consistent with library traditions of free and open access, self empowerment, and learner control. Trainings to duplicate library learning services are provided to libraries, community agencies, grass roots organizations and volunteers. (Lifelong Learning Services, Broward County Public Library)

Florida FL (cont'd)

The goal of the Center for Adult Learning (CAL) is to provide functionally illiterate adults the opportunity and resources with which to "function successfully on the job and in society, achieve [their] individual goals and develop [their] knowledge and potential." [National Literacy Act of 1991] We also provide a bridge between one-to-one tutoring programs and the GED classroom. Using computer-assisted instruction enhances the learning process and increases the self-confidence of the students. We also provide a New Reader Collection in the Main Library and all branch libraries in the system.
(Center for Adult Learning, Jacksonville Public Libraries)

Georgia GA

Our program is geared to promote lifelong learning. We firmly believe that if we equip adult new learners with the skills necessary to participate in society, whether it be on a social or economic level, then this will ultimately lead to the eradication of illiteracy. As adults become more literate, they will pass on their love of education to their offsprings who in turn will strive to make positive impacts on society. We strive to instill "all adults successful" and provide the tools necessary to make that come to pass.
(Learning Center, Athens-Clarke County Public Library)

N.R. (Literacy Program, Sara Hightower Regional Library)

To increase the level of literacy in DeKalb County, the library assists community literacy efforts by providing materials, space, and referral services.
(Literacy Program, DeKalb County Public Library)

Illinois IL

Provide adult literacy education in a non-threatening environment.
(LVA-Elgin, Gail Borden Public Library)

Family Literacy Partnership existed [as a formal program] 92/93 & 93/94. Family literacy focusing on parent/child skills - literature based.
(Family Literacy Partnership, Bensenville Library)

Our mission statement says "...to extend educational opportunities to Lake County adult students and their families."
(Libraries for Literacy in Lake County, Waukegan Public Library)

Indiana IN

Our program provides individual tutoring through volunteer tutors for adult non-readers, low-level readers, intermediate readers who want to get a GED or go to college, and newcomers to our country who need to learn conversational English. We also offer a family literacy program aimed at helping parents read to their children. Recently we have opened our program to children who are tutored both at the library and at school. Numerous requests from parents for such help moved us in this direction along with the fact that adult enrollment has dropped due to greater availability of jobs at present.
(Literacy Program, Michigan City Public Library)

We're in the business of helping adults over the age of 16 who are not in school improve their reading and writing skills through the use of volunteer tutors in one-on-one or small group instruction. We also help adults who are learning English as their second language in the same way. We offer phonics and computer instruction, as well. (Library Literacy Program, Anderson Public Library)

Indiana IN (cont'd)	Paraphrased from long attached statement: To promote the Library as a lifelong learning center; to promote public awareness; to promote...community involvement in solving civic, social, educational, health, and employment problems. To provide basic reading, writing, spelling, and math help to adults and families in need of it. To provide tutor training services to this end, as well as materials for students and tutors, adult new-reader and circulation literacy collection. To develop cooperative links with area businesses and community/social organizations also interested in working with adult nonreaders or beginning readers, etc. (Knox County Literacy Program, Knox County Public Library)
Kansas KS	Provide learning opportunities for adults 16 years of age and older who are no longer enrolled in school and have not obtained a functional basic education. Instruction is directed toward mastering competency skills in English, including speaking, reading and writing English, and basic math skills. In addition, preparation for the GED exam is provided. (Project Finish, Johnson County Library, Shawnee Mission)
Massachusetts MA	To provide adult basic education and a family literacy program using a whole language-based model. Curriculum is developed based on learners' interests, needs, and goals. (Read Write/Now Program, Springfield City Library-Mason Square Branch) To facilitate access, communication and linkages with newcomer groups and institutions, employers, and agencies in the Pioneer Valley. We try to accommodate the varying needs/schedules/interests of students by providing a choice of study options (classroom, one-to-one tutoring, computer-aided instruction) and support services (advocacy referrals, job search, childcare, counseling). (Center for New Americans, Jones Library) The Library's ESOL-based family literacy program integrates language and literacy studies with parenting skills and library skills development. Curriculum is grounded in exercises that use the library to increase the ability of newcomers to communicate in English, develop independent learning skills, gain exposure to technology, and become more effective parents. (Newcomer Family Literacy Project, Lawrence Public Library) To provide instruction in basic reading and writing to adults in order for them to meet their needs and reach their goals. (Literacy Program, Thomas Crane Public Library)
Maryland MD	Project Literacy provides free one-to-one instruction by volunteer tutors to any adult who lives or works in Howard County. Clients come to learn how to read, improve their reading/writing/speaking skills, learn English, learn functional math skills, and learn how to function in a literate society. (Project Literacy, Howard County Library)
Michigan MI	[Our program] provides 1:1 tutoring to adults in Montcalm County having 0-8 grade reading or math skills, and teaches English as a second language to ethnic minorities with limited English language proficiency. (MARC Literacy Program, Greenville Public Library)

Minnesota MN	Provide free, flexible, self-paced instruction to adults aged 16 and older who read, write, and compute below a 12th grade level. [Basic goals are] to serve 450 learners a year, improve skill levels in 35% of enrollees, recruit/maintain 60 tutors a year. [Another goal is] to collaborate in at least 4 multicultural, multi-agency presentations (sic). (Franklin Learning Center, Franklin Community Library, Minneapolis Public Library) [This] is a project to develop an active partnership between the library and the Hubbs Center for Lifelong Learning of the Saint Paul Public Schools in order to create a successful link for adult learners with the free and easily accessible resources of the library. Staff training for the organizations will include hands on training in new CD-ROM products, joint orientations and sessions to address the needs of adult learners. Hubbs staff and students will assist the library in the selection of new adult reading materials. A direct computer link to the library on-line catalog and its "information kiosk" will be installed at the Hubbs Center. (Linking Libraries & Literacy for Lifelong Learning, Lexington Branch Library, St. Paul)
North Carolina NC	Library directs Community of Readers, a network of over 50 organizations and agencies working to promote reading and literacy. Three branches offer classes in the library (GED, ESL). All libraries provide materials. (Community of Readers, Glenwood Library)
Nebraska NE	In cooperation with Central Community College, [the Association] provides ABE at no cost to students 16 years or older, and not enrolled in school. This includes English as a second language classes, preparation for GED testing, basic adult literacy self-study and living skills. In addition, PVLA offers tutoring for adults and a family literacy program for adult students and their families and at-risk families in the community. We are located in the public library and receive in-kind support, but do not receive funding through the City or the library. (Platte Valley Literacy Association, Columbus Public Library)
New Jersey NJ	Our program's overall purposes and goals are to improve the basic skills for English, reading, and math for adult residents of Elizabeth. (Basic Skills for Reading & ESL, Elizabeth Public Library) Our overall purpose is to empower our students [to take control of and be able to] change their own lives. We follow a student-centered approach allowing learners to focus on what they feel they need to learn. We encourage them to progress from learning how to read to reading to learn. We hope they'll take a more active interest in their own community. (Literacy for Non-English Speakers, Paterson Free Public Library)
New Mexico NM	Provide basic reading, ESL, computer literacy and family literacy programs. (LVA-Socorro County, Socorro Public Library)
New York NY	The Library Literacy Center is a library-sponsored, Laubach affiliated, adult basic literacy program which, using adult volunteer tutors, provides 1:1 literacy help to adult learners who come to us for help. Although our primary focus is the teaching of reading, we also try to work with the student's other literacy needs such as math, spelling, GED preparation, if we are able and if the student wants that kind of help. (Library Literacy Center of Prendergast Library, Jamestown) To teach adults how to write and read and navigate life intelligently using technology and all resources available to all citizens. (Literacy Program, Brooklyn Public Library)

Population Served: As part of the NYC Adult Literacy Initiative, [we fulfill our] commitment to neighborhoods throughout the City by providing culturally diverse populations opportunities for lifelong learning. The Library is committed to serving adult learners who have a range of personal, professional,and occupational goals. Within the NYC provider network, the libraries are mandated to offer literacy instruction to adults who are at the beginning stages of their reading development (0-4.9). Without [our] program these learners would have limited access to instruction as they would test too low on standardized tests to enter Board of Education or Community College programs. In addition, budget reductions have forced the Board and CUNY to reduce the number of pre-GED classes offered. **Program Development:** The Centers are committed to remaining current in instructional methodology, assessment procedures, curriculum development and the implementation of new program initiatives. **Volunteer Training:** In NYC, the Library literacy programs are funded as volunteer programs. New York Public Library is committed to the recruitment and training of volunteer tutors, who are the primary providers of direct instruction. **Collection Development:** Part of our funding is allocated to develop collections of print materials for adult new readers. These collections, located at CRW sites, can be borrowed by all students enrolled in the program. The Library also makes these resources available to practitioners at other NYC literacy programs, in the form of deposit collection loans. Instructors may visit a site and select materials appropriate for their classes. Over the past 12 years, the Library has established Lifelong Learning collections at all 82 branch libraries. These are available for borrowing by the general public. **Technology:** Computer instruction is used in the 8 CRW programs. We have been working since FY94 to upgrade hardware and software to enable students to capitalize on multimedia advances in educational technology. **Family Literacy:** We have embarked on a system-wide initiative to expand family literacy. As a result of a series of workshops in early 1995, we are currently engaged in developing a Families Writing curriculum. (Centers for Reading and Writing, New York Public Library)

Oklahoma OK

The Council provides free, confidential one-on-one tutoring to any adult in the area who wants to learn to read or to improve reading skills.
(Moore Literacy Council, Cleveland County Library)

To provide individual tutoring to low level literacy and ESL adult students in order to raise the literacy level of our country, and enable them to become more competent employees, parents, and citizens. We target families through special parent reading programs and the workplace through a business site ESL class.
(Great Plains Literacy Council, Southern Prairie Library System)

To provide tutoring in reading and the English language to adults in the 1510-square mile county; train tutors and trainers; promote the interest and cooperative efforts of other groups in the community; work cooperatively with other literacy providers in the state and nation.
(Literacy Council of LeFlore County, Buckley Public Library)

Oregon OR

LEARN (Literacy Education and Referral Network) draws a variety of people and agencies together to solve problems of common interest regarding adult basic and bilingual education, serves as support services for volunteer tutors and their organizations, provides books and materials to all county libraries and volunteer groups, recruits volunteers and students, referring them to appropriate education or other resources.
(LEARN Project, Eugene Public Library)

Pennsylvania PA

The RDP enhances the Library's role of provider of support for learners of all ages by locating, evaluating, purchasing, and distributing to Philadelphia literacy agencies and to individual adults the best learning materials written on a low reading level on a wide range of subjects. RDP serves adults of all ages, ethnic backgrounds, and learning needs. RDP also stocks a wide range of low-reading-level leisure reading materials, providing adult new readers with popular genre books written on the 8th grade reading level or below. RDP also provides limited amounts of GED materials to satisfy state funding mandates. (Reader Development Program, Free Library of Philadelphia)

The goal of our Literacy Program is to reduce illiteracy in Bradford and Wyoming Counties. The Literacy Program trains volunteer tutors and provides free and confidential 1:1 tutoring for adults and teenagers. The Literacy Program recruits, trains, and supports its volunteer tutors. It also provides support for its adult literacy students.
(Bradford-Wyoming County Literacy Program, Bradford County Library)

Rhode Island RI

Our literacy program provides tutor training in Basic Literacy (reading and writing) and ESL to help functionally illiterate adults to improve reading, writing, and conversational English skills. (LVA Kent County, Coventry Public Library)

South Carolina SC

For many years we have provided materials, a board member for the local literacy agency, tutoring space, and encouragement to the community effort. Now we are becoming more directly involved by designating space at a new branch to be used by that community literacy association. We have also conducted an award-winning literacy awareness campaign, always working very closely with the Greenville Literacy Association.
(Literacy Program, Greenville County Library)

Texas TX

Teach adults to read and/or speak English in 0-5 reading level. Orient these adults to all library services. Prepare adults to succeed with their tutors by teaching basic study skills. Create lifelong independent library users.
(LVA-Sterling Municipal Library)

The Center assists individuals of all ages find the services and resources they need to learn how to read and write, to become legal residents or U.S. citizens, to obtain their GED, to become computer literate, to know how to use the library, and to help them achieve their goals and develop their knowledge and potential. Since 1989 the Center offers five areas of service free to the public: information and referral, a materials collection, instruction services, community outreach and promotion, and research and development. [In the instructional services area, specifically, we] provide computers for self-paced instruction, recruit and train volunteer tutors and match them with students, offer library facilities to outside agencies and volunteer tutors for small group literacy and ABE education.
(Literacy Center, El Paso Public Library)

To teach ESL, pre-GED,and GED to help any person from the area who wants to study. (Proyecto Adelante, Weslaco Public Library)

To increase opportunities for adults in the surrounding communities of 11 branch libraries to receive individual or small group instruction in literacy or ESL by providing trained volunteers and materials.
(Literacy Programs, Harris County Public Library)

Texas TX (cont'd)	We try to meet everyone's goals. We provide ESL, pre-GED, GED, citizenship, and of course, basic literacy for those who can't read at all. Many of our students have graduated from high school, but do not have skills to attend college. Some just need special skills, such as typing. We assist them in filling out forms or studying for special projects at work. Our biggest classes are pre-GED level: those reading at a 5th-8th grade level. (Andrews Adult Literacy Program, Andrews Public Library)
Utah UT	We provide one-on-one literacy and ESL instruction to adults in Cache County (northern Utah). Instruction is provided by trained volunteer tutors, and is free and individualized. Curriculum is closely tied to individual goals and needs, especially goals relating to parenting, jobs, or personal skills. (Bridgerland Literacy, Logan Library)
Virginia VA	There are four (4) components to the Newport News Library System's Literacy Program. We provide individual tutoring, workplace literacy and pre-GED classes, and also family literacy programs. Our focus is to provide a skills enhancement program that will diminish the cycle of intergenerational illiteracy in the community. (Literacy Program, Newport News Public Library)
Washington WA	Family literacy program--offers literacy tutoring which addresses the needs of the adult learner and at the same time teaches the adults the skills and attitudes they need to help their children and grandchildren be successful learners in school. The focus is intergenerational learning and support. (Project READ, Longview Public Library) Our literacy programming includes services for both native English speakers and limited English speakers. We operate a Literacy Action Center where 1:1 tutoring takes place,and where we provide an in-house lending library, computer access for students, and a mentor program for volunteer tutors. The Center is a special project of Washington Literacy. The Library collaborates with the Literacy Center in a family literacy program called Start Smart,which is coordinated by the Children's Librarian. Other programs/services include Born to Read (for mothers with newborn or very young children), The Reading Place (space in the Central Library and 10 branches where students and tutors may use books and other information for the new adult reader), and various ESL services including direct instruction, audiocassette technology and a special ESL reading collection. (Library Literacy Program/Lifelong Learning, Seattle Public Library)
Wisconsin WI	Paraphrased from long attached statement: An affiliate of LVA national, we serve as the national LVA liaison for the state of Wisconsin. LVA-CV provides literacy services to adults and families in a regional area where some 60% of the population lives on farms or small communities. We provide 1:1 tutoring and recruit and train volunteer tutors for the program. Sharing the mission of our national parent organization, we strive to develop strong local partnerships... create community awareness...develop effective funding strategies...undertake effective student and tutor recruiting and instruction...provide facilities conducive to learning...operate family literacy programs...support workplace education programs...and pursue "cutting edge" developments in techniques and materials, including greater use of technology where appropriate. Based on the work of a Strategic Planning Committee, we have adopted a long range plan to further develop our outreach and effectiveness. (LVA Chippea Valley/Eau Claire, L.E. Phillips Memorial Public Library)

West Virginia WV	To provide a comprehensive literacy program that serves all segments of the population of Monroe County. To promote family literacy in reading, writing, and math. To develop and implement a training program for tutors of math. To remove barriers that prevent a rural population from participating in literacy programs. (Literacy Program, Monroe County & Peterstown Public Libraries)

By percentage, indicate makeup of your adult student body by age, ethnicity/race, gender, employment status,whether on public assistance,and other demographic variables you consider important.

LP2
page 1 of 2

		Gender		Race/Ethnicity						WorkStatus		Retired	Age	17	25t29	45to49		
	N.R.	M	F	Black	White	Asian	Hispanic	NAmer	Other	Employed	Unemp	Or Other	16 and	to	to	to 59	60+	
Local Library Literacy Program												inc.Unkn	under	25t29	44t49			
LVA-Anniston Calhoun Cty AL	1																	
Lit Council Hot Spring Cty AR		51	39	48	48	4							19	14	29	19	19	
Reading Together-Riv Valley Libr AR		58	42		13	4	83			81	19		8	23	54	13	2	
Napa City Cnty Libr Pgm CA		46	54		52	8	38	2										ESL students 71% women, 95% Hispanic, 18% aged 20-29, 51% 30-39.
Alameda Cnty Libr Pgm CA		47	53	19	29	24	25		3					22	66	8	4	
Partners in Reading - San Jose CA		40	60	17	21	8	47	3	3									No time to gather other demographic data.
Commerce Public Library Pgm CA		50	50				95		5					20	50	30		70% h.s. grads.
LVA Marin Cnty - San Rafael PL CA				2	8	14	64	1	2					36	47	10	7	
Mesa Cnty PL Grand Junction CO		59	41	2	50	9	32	4	3				3	15	66	12	5	42% h.s. noncompletion, 58% hs grad or more
LVA-Greater Waterbury CT		45	55	15	43	13	30			32	56	12		21	54	18	7	96%=public assistance/low income
Proj READS-Sussex Cnty Lit Cncl DE	1																	
LVA-Wilmington Libr DE		52	48	36	33	17	14	0		46	28	26		12	60	19	9	Ap 45% h.s. noncompletion. 14% on publ assistance.
Proj LEAD - Miami Dade PL Sys FL		56	44	61	13		18							30	50	14	2	75% h.s. noncompletion.
Panhandle LibrLit Consortium FL	1																	
Tampa- Hillsbrgh Lit Cncl/Cnty Libr FL		52	48	32	34	10	24	1						12	62	15	10	
Brevard Cnty Libr Lit Pgm/Cocoa FL	1																	
LitingLrng Svcs-Broward Cnty PL FL		53	47	48	27	5	12		7					16	57	16	9	25% have h.s. diploma
Cntr Ad Lrng-Jacksonville PL FL		62	38	60	34				6		63			18	45	6	12	69% h.s. noncompletion
Lrng Ctr - Athens-Clarke Cnty PL GA		1	99	50	2	46			2									51% on public assistance
Sara Hightower Rel Libr Pgm GA	1																	
DeKalb Cnty PL Decatur GA	1																	
LVA Elgin - Gail Borden PL IL		39	61	13	25	12	50							8	65	21	6	57% h.s. noncompletion
Fam Lit Ptnrship Bensenville Libr IL	1																	Note: Pgm no longer exists formally.
Libr for Lit Lake Cnty Waukegan PL IL		51	49	30	40	6	22		3	65	34	1						Average age 38, 14% on public assistance.
Lit Pgm of MI City PL, IN		49	51	38	31	16	15											Age range 30-50, enrollees 1/3 ESL, most UNEMPLOYED at enrollment.
LitPgm AndersonPL,IN	1																	Data reportedly not available.
Knox Cnty PL Literacy Pgm, IN		63	37	2	84	9		4	1				1	17	46	7	15	
Proj Finish Johnson Cnty PL KS		44	56	6	58	18	16	1		42	58							Avg age 30, 77% less than 9th-grade ed, 14% on public assistance.
Read Write/Now-Sprngfld City Libr MA		45	55							66								Age range of most 30-45; 33% on public assistance.
Ctr New Amer -Jones Libr Amherst MA		30	70		15	60	25			25	20						25	All students are immigrants.
NewcomerFamLitPro Lawrence PL MA			100				100			40								All between ages 20-41; 60% on public assistance.
LibLitPro Thomas Crane PL Quincy MA		55	45							75					40	30		Lrng Disabled 75%; 50% young kids at home; age range 25-75.
ProjLit Howard Cnty Libr Columbia MD		34	66							70								Age range 18-77, 52% foreign born; 10% publ assist, 20% lrng disabled.
MARC LitPgm Greenville PL, MI		90	10		75		25			90					50			Age range 25-65, 50% 40 years old; 10% on public assist.
FranklinLrngCtr Minneapolis PL, MN		63	37	63	6	7	10	9	6				11	36	47	2		37%=h.s. noncompletion, 70% single.
LLLLL Lexington BrLibr St Paul, MN		45	55	33	30	25	9	3		31	66	3		36	53	10	1	9% disabld, 2% homeless, 2% in corrections, 51% on public assistance.
CommRdrs Glnwd Lib Greensboro NC		40	60	50	30	10			10									
PlatteValleyLitAssnColumbus PL, NE	1																	Info given too incomplete to be of any use.
BasicSkfor RdngESL Elizabeth PL, NJ	1																	Respondee gave demographics on overall population ofarea.
LitNonEngSpkrs Paterson Free PL, NJ		55	45	75			25			90	10		20					80% adult, age range 18-71; 10% on public assistance.
LVA Socorro Cnty Socorro PL, NM	1																	Repondee indicated "mostly Hispanic population."
Prendergast LibLitCtr Jamestown NY		63	37	1	70	5	24			40	60			22	53	15	10	90% get pub asst including SSI; many of employed in workfare pgms
LitPgm Brooklyn PL, NY		47	53	78	3	1	14	1		47	53			7	58	28	8	28% on public assistance, 23% single parents.
CRW-NY Public Lib, NY		46	54	61	10	3	24	1		43	57							NYPL srvs Manh,Bronx,SI. 35% on public assistance.
Moore LitCncl Cleveland Cnty L, OK		60	40											40	30	30		We don't ask questions re ethnicity/race or if on public assistance, etc.
GrtPlnsLitCncl Sthern Prairie LS, OK		33	67	11	27	4	58			32	68			2	76	10	12	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

By percentage, indicate makeup of your adult student body by age, ethnicity/race, gender, employment status,whether on public assistance,and other demographic variables you consider important.

		Gender		Race/Ethnicity						WorkStatus		Retired	Age	17	25t29	45to49		
	N.R.	M	F	Black	White	Asian	Hispanic	NAmer	Other	Employed	Unemp	Or Other	16 and	to	to	to 59	60+	
Local Library Literacy Program												Inc.Unkn	under	25t29	44t49			
LitCncl LeFlore Cnty, Buckley PL, OK		50	50		43		42	11					14	32	43	4	3	57% h.s. noncompletion.
LEARN, Eugene PL, OR	1																	Students registered through Community College & Lit Cncl
ReadersDevPgm Free Lib Phila, PA		46	54	56	20	10	13	1					12	25	46	11	6	Figures for 29,000 students enrolled in 204 pgms served by RDP
Bradford Wyoming CntyLitPgm, PA		51	49	1	85	10	3			42	36	19		24	64	10	2	50% on public assistance.
LVA-Kent Cnty, Coventry PL, RI		57	43	1	58	10	30	1		71	13	16		8	66	25	1	55% h.s. noncompletion.
LibLitPro, Greenville Cnty Lib, SC	1																	No idea, actual services provided by Greer Literacy Partnership.
LVa-Sterling Municipal Libr, TX		36	64	9	11		73		7	36	28	36		14	61	12	1	
LibLitCtr El Paso PL, TX		15	85				99								98			Don't request job or ecnomic status info from our students.
Proyecto Adelante Weslaco PL, TX							98											Ages17-50+. Don't know job status, background, or citizenship.
LibLitPgms Harris Cnty PL, TX		46	54	26	22	32	20			47	53			10	64	16	10	
AdLitPgm of Andrews PL, TX		33	67	1	24		74		1					50	43	6	1	
Bridgerland Lit,Logan Libr, UT		47	53	1	36	21	35		7	83	7	10		27	53	17		
LitPgm Newport News PL, VA				80						3								Age range 18-65, 10% on public assistance.
ProjREAD Longview PL, WA		49	51	1	34	44	21			48	52			20	64	10	6	
LibLitPgmLfingLng, Seattle PL, WA			100	30	25	25	20							100				Figures for Born to Read program, only pgm for which data now collected.
LVA ChippewaPhillipsMeml PL, WI	1																	Scant info not given in usable form.
LitPgm Monroe/Peterstown PL, WV		35	65		99					15								30% on pub asst. Ethnic/racial makeup reflects county pop. as whole.
	14	*2069*	*2501*	*1057*	*1368*	*490*	*1427*	*43*	*66*	*1260*	*781*	*123*	*88*	*717*	*1760*	*444*	*193*	
Average % - All Pgms Reporting		**45**	**55**	**23**	**30**	**11**	**32**	**1**	**1.5**	**60**			**3**	**22**	**55**	**14**	**6**	

Note 1: Where percentages do not total to 100, it is either because of rounding or because a program reported some data as "unknown."

Note 2: Due to variation in the age groupings used by respondees, data shown for this variable reflects orders of magnitude.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

How many years has your program been in operation?			LP3
How long have you been in your present position?			LP4
	Years Program In Operation	**Yrs Respondee In Present Position**	
Local Library Literacy Program			
LVA-Anniston Calhoun Cty AL	10	7	
Lit Council Hot Spring County AR	6	4.5	
Reading Together-River Valley Libr AR	23	7	
Napa City County Library Program CA	12	10	
Alameda County Library Pgm CA	11	8	
Partners in Reading - San Jose CA	6.5	4	
Commerce Public Library Pgm CA	12	3	
LVA Marin County - San Rafael PL CA	10	7	
Mesa County PL, Grand Junction CO	10	7	
LVA-Greater Waterbury CT	21	5	
Proj READS-Sussex Cnty Lit Cncl DE	6	6	
LVA-Wilmington Libr DE	13	8	
Proj LEAD - Miami Dade PL Sys FL	10	3	
Panhandle LibrLit Consortium FL	8	0.5	
Tampa- Hillsbrgh Lit Cncl/Cnty Libr FL	10	4	
Brevard Cnty Libr Lit Pgm/Cocoa FL	10	10	
Lifelong Lrng Svcs-Broward Cnty PL FL	15	10	
Cntr Ad Lrng-Jacksonville PL FL	10.5	11	
Learning Ctr - Athens-Clarke County PL GA	8	4	
Sara Hightower Regl Libr Pgm GA	20	9	
DeKalb Cnty PL Decatur GA	10	7	
LVA Elgin - Gail Borden PL IL	12	10	
Fam Lit Ptnrship Bensenville Libr IL	2	14	Program no longer exists formally.
Libr for Lit Lake County, Waukegan PL IL	10	10	
Literacy Pgm of Michigan City PL, IN	8	5	
Literacy Pgm, Anderson Public Library, IN	10	2	
Knox Cnty PL Literacy Pgm, IN	4	3	
Proj Finish Johnson Cnty PL KS	10	7	
Read Write/Now-Sprngfld City Libr MA	8	6	
Ctr New Amer -Jones Libr Amherst MA	9	9	
Newcomer Fam Lit Pro, Lawrence PL MA	8	2	
Lib Lit Pro, Thomas Crane PL, Quincy MA	10	10	
Proj Lit, Howard County Libr, Columbia MD	8	8	
MARC Lit Pgm Greenville PL, MI	9.5	9.5	
Franklin Learning Ctr Minneapolis PL, MN	7	2	
LLLLL Lexington Br Libr St Paul, MN	1	8	
Comm Rdrs, Glenwood Lib, Greensboro NC	6	6	
Platte Valley Lit Assn, Columbus PL, NE	15	0.75	
Basic Skills for Rdng/ESL, Elizabeth PL, NJ	9	9	But total of 23 as FT libranan.
LitNonEngSpkrs Paterson Free PL, NJ	5	1	
LVA Socorro Cnty Socorro PL, NM	6	6	
Prendergast LibLitCtr Jamestown NY	3	3	
Literacy Program, Brooklyn PL, NY	18	4	
Centers Rdng Writing, NYPL, NYC	11	3.5	
Moore LitCncl Cleveland Cnty L, OK	5	6	
GrtPlnsLitCncl Sthern Prairie LS, Altus, OK	10	5	
LitCncl LeFlore Cnt Buckley PL, Poteau, OK	10	8	
LEARN, Eugene PL, OR	10	10	
Readers Dev Pgm, Free Libr Phila, PA	28	5	
Bradford Wyoming CntyLitPgm, PA	15	14	
LVA-Kent Cnty, Coventry PL, RI	15	3	
LibLitPro, Greenville Cnty Lib, SC			N.R.
LVa-Sterling Municipal Libr, TX	10	5	
Lib Lit Ctr, El Paso PL, TX	6	4	
Proyecto Adelante Weslaco PL, TX	7	6	
LibLitPgms Harris Cnty PL, TX	8	0.5	
Ad Lit Pgm of Andrews PL, TX	10	8	
Bridgerland Lit,Logan Libr, UT	8	4.5	
LitPgm Newport News PL, VA	10	1	
ProjREAD Longview PL, WA	9	5	
LibLitPgmLflngLng, Seattle PL, WA	4	0.5	
LVA ChippewaPhillipsMeml PL, WI	10	10	
LitPgm Monroe/Peterstown PL, WV	6	6	
	612.5	375.25	
Avg Yrs Pgm In Oprtn/Respondee In Job	**9.9**	**6**	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Please indicate the size of your program with respect to the following indicators:

LP5

Local Library Literacy Program	# F/T Staff	# PT Staff	# Paid Staff	# Vol. Staff	# Students Served FY95	Operating Budget FY95		
LVA-Anniston Calhoun Cty AL		1	1	34	27	36,474	FY95/96	
Lit Council Hot Spring Cty AR	1		1	50	80	47,000	Oct 95-Sept96	
Reading Together-Riv Valley Libr AR		5	5	12	62	34,180		
Napa City Cnty Libr Pgm CA	2		2	164	207	113,000		
Alameda Cnty Libr Pgm CA	5	6	11	165	424	557,000	Adult Pgm Only	
Partners in Reading - San Jose CA	4	3	7			164,880		
Commerce Public Library Pgm CA		2	2	38	54	73,500		
LVA Marin Cnty - San Rafael PL CA	1	5	6	235	287	182,499		
Mesa Cnty PL Grand Junction CO	2	1	3	202	194	45,000		
LVA-Greater Waterbury CT	0	3	3	140	350	56,000		
Proj READS-Sussex Cnty Lit Cncl DE	1	1	1	125	65	2,500		
LVA-Wilmington Libr DE	3		3	300	225	140,000		
Proj LEAD - Miami Dade PL Sys FL	2		2	200	275		DK=Part of Library Budget	
Panhandle LibrLit Consortium FL	1	1	1	10	46		$ = N.R.	
Tampa- Hillsbrgh Lit Cncl/Cnty Libr FL	1.25		1.25	243	434		$ = N.R.	
Brevard Cnty Libr Lit Pgm/Cocoa FL	1		1	900	400	30,000		
LifingLrng Svcs-Broward Cnty PL FL	15		15	400	1,500		D.K. Student # includes children	
Cntr Ad Lrng-Jacksonville PL FL	1	2	3	8	222	50,500	Plus library in-kind.	
Lrng Ctr - Athens-Clarke Cnty PL GA	1	7	7	40	120		$ = N.R.	
Sara Hightower Rel Libr Pgm GA	4	2	4	69	126	47,000		
DeKalb Cnty PL Decatur GA	1	1	1.5		8,448	22,000	FY95-96. Librarians in 9 branches	
LVA Elgin - Gail Borden PL IL	3	5	8	180	116	250,000	/devote part of their time to literacy.	
Fam Lit Ptnrship Bensenville Libr IL		2		4	70		Budget = n/a	
Libr for Lit Lake Cnty Waukegan PL IL	2		2	350	360	61,000		
Lit Pgm of MI City PL, IN	1		1	65	55	32,000		
LitPgm AndersonPL,IN	1	1	2	70	147	35,000	$ from LSCA Title VI	
Knox Cnty PL Literacy Pgm, IN		1	1	82	85		$ = N.R.	
Proj Finish Johnson Cnty PL KS	1		6	15			# Students/$ = N.R.	
Read Write/Now-Sprngfld City Libr MA	6	8	14	7	96	176,000	Also 30 preschoolers in fam lit pgm.	
Ctr New Amer -Jones Libr Amherst MA	1	1	2	65	80	14,000	$ = for library portion only	
NewcomerFamLitPro Lawrence PL MA		4	4	2	11	10,219		
LibLitPro Thomas Crane PL Quincy MA	1	1	2	150	150	35,000		
ProjLit Howard Cnty Libr Columbia MD	1	1	2	100	170	10,000	$=materials only; staff salary/benefits extra.	
MARC LitPgm Greenville PL, MI	1	1	1.5	100	100	41,000		
FranklinLrngCtr Minneapolis PL, MN	2		2	77	450	75,000		
LLLLL Lexington BrLibr St Paul, MN		1				35,000	$ = Plus $32,000 library/Hubbs Ctr in-kind.	
CommRdrs Glnwd Lib Greensboro NC	1	1		30	50		$ = N.R. /No direct service provider.	
PlatteValleyLitAssnColumbus PL, NE		6	6	129	435	64,900	$ = Yr. ended Dec. 1995	
BasicSkfor RdngESL Elizabeth PL, NJ	1	1	2	1	600		$ = In library budget.	
LitNonEngSpkrs Paterson Free PL, NJ	3	1	4	44	120		$ = N.R.	
LVA Socorro Cnty Socorro PL, NM		4	4	20	47	31,000		
Prendergast LibLitCtr Jamestown NY	1		1	60	40		$ - n/a	
LitPgm Brooklyn PL, NY	19	34	55	157	739	781,000		
CRW-NY Public Lib, NY	25	25	50	108	1,032	1,189,013		
Moore LitCncl Cleveland Cnty L, OK	1			50	80		$ - D.K. - Included in county budget.	
GrtPlnsLitCncl Sthern Prairie LS, Altus, OK	2	2	4	84	125		$ = N.R.	
LitCncl LeFlore Cnt Buckley PL, Poteau, OK	1		1	50	113	24,042	FT staff also includes 1 VISTA	
LEARN, Eugene PL, OR		1		310	4,150	35,000	#s for volunteers/students include library &	
ReadersDevPgm Free Lib Phila, PA	2	6	8	108	28,636	420,345	/& comm coll pgms. $ = library only	
Bradford Wyoming CntyLitPgm, PA	2	2	4	90	126	77,175		
LVA-Kent Cnty, Coventry PL, RI		1	1	111	137	29,376	1994-95	
LibLitPro, Greenville Cnty Lib, SC							n/a	
LVa-Sterling Municipal Libr, TX		16	16	58	140	85,000		
LibLitCtr El Paso PL, TX	2	4	6	10	170	79,344		
Provecto Adelante Weslaco PL, TX		3	3			35,000		
LibLitPgms Harris Cnty PL, TX	1		1	125	220	64,739		
AdLitPgm of Andrews PL, TX	1	4	4	17	292	75,000		
Bridgerland Lit,Logan Libr, UT	2	1		300	140	48,100	#volunteers=includes 6 orgs we work with.	
LitPgm Newport News PL, VA	1		1	14	49	37,225		
ProjREAD Longview PL, WA		2	2	38	55		$ = N.R.	
LibLitPgmLflngLng, Seattle PL, WA	2	1		20	60		$ = N.R.	
LVA ChippewaPhillipsMeml PL, WI	5	11	15	35	140	191,000	#s include family literacy.	
LitPgm Monroe/Peterstown PL, WV		4	4	52	110	70,000		
								Avg perstudent
Totals	138.25	196	3E+02	6,623	53,242	$5,713,011		$107
w/o NYPL/BrooklynPL					51,471	3741998		$72 w/o NYC
w/o budgets of $250,000+					22,295	2515653		$112 w/o $250M+

What are your principal sources of funding (check all that apply, giving relative percentages if possible):	State Libr System/ Agency	Local Govt	State Govt	Foundation Grants	Federal Grant(s)	Local/State Business & Industry	Ind. Don.	Other	LP6
Local Library Literacy Program									
LVA-Anniston Calhoun Cty AL					100.0				LSCA Title VI
Lit Council Hot Spring Cty AR			18.0		81.0		1.0		
Reading Together-Riv Valley Libr AR	10.0		15.0		75.0				
Napa City Cnty Libr Pgm CA	7.0	60.0			30.0		3.0		
Alameda Cnty Libr Pgm Freemont, CA	x	x			x				Fed=LSCA Title VI, 321 CDE
Partners in Reading - San Jose CA	23.0	48.6	3.2		25.2				Fed = LSCA Title VI
Commerce Public Library Pgm CA	18.0	80.0	1.5				0.5		
LVA Marin Cnty - San Rafael PL CA	35.0		5.0	1.0	58.0		1.0		
Mesa Cnty PL Grand Junction CO				2.0	78.0	2.0	4.0	13.0	Other=United Way. Pgm Director's sal. pd by Libr, Fed LSCA now gone
LVA-Greater Waterbury CT		x	x	x		x	x		
Proj READS-Sussex Cnty Lit Cncl DE		x			x		x		
LVA-Wilmington Libr DE		1.0			45.0	20.0	20.0	10.0	Other=United Way
Proj LEAD - Miami Dade PL Sys FL	x	x	x		x		x		Most comes from local govt
Panhandle LibrLit Consortium FL	40.0	20.0			20.0			20.0	Other=United Way
Tampa- Hillsbrgh Lit Cncl/Cnty Libr FL		50.0				10.0	40.0		
Brevard Cnty Libr Lit Pgm/Cocoa FL		x					x		
LifngLrng Svcs-Broward Cnty PL FL		x							
Cntr Ad Lrng-Jacksonville PL FL		20.0			75.0			5.0	Other=Friends of Libr, Local govt=library in-kind
Lrng Ctr - Athens-Clarke Cnty PL GA		x			x				
Sara Hightower Rel Libr Pgm GA	x	x	x	x	xxx				
DeKalb Cnty PL Decatur GA		36.0	1.0		63.0				FY95-96
LVA Elgin - Gail Borden PL IL	32.0	1.0		16.0	6.0	22.0	10.0	13.0	Other=United Way
Fam Lit Ptnrship Bensenville Libr IL	x		x						
Libr for Lit Lake Cnty Waukegan PL IL	x	x	x	x			x		
Lit Pgm of MI City PL, IN	x	x				x	x		
LitPgm AndersonPL,IN					x		x	x	Other=trng fees, Anderson CommSchCorp, MadCntyLitCoalition
Knox Cnty PL Literacy Pgm, IN	x				80.0	x	x	x	Other=United Way/other fundraising
Proj Finish Johnson Cnty PL KS			x		x				
Read Write/Now-Sprngfld City Libr MA	x		x	x	x	x	x		Individual Donations = Very little
Ctr New Amer -Jones Libr Amherst MA	92.0	5.0					3.0		
NewcomerFamLitPro Lawrence PL MA	x = past	20.0	80.0	x = past					
LibLitPro Thomas Crane PL Quincy MA			95.0			5.0			State govt= State Aid To Libr Funds from SDE
ProjLit Howard Cnty Libr Columbia MD		x				x			
MARC LitPgm Greenville PL, MI			5.0		71.0	10.0	12.0	2.0	Other=United Way
FranklinLrngCtr Minneapolis PL, MN	x	x		x		x			
LLLLL Lexington BrLibr St Paul, MN		x			x	x			
CommRdrs Glnwd Lib Greensboro NC		65.0		35.0					
PlatteValleyLitAssnColumbus PL, NE			15.4		50.0		1.3	33.3	Other-VFW/ChamberComm 8.5, Area United Way 24.8
BasicSkfor RdngESL Elizabeth PL, NJ		x	x						
LitNonEngSpkrs Paterson Free PL, NJ	x		x		x	x		x	Other=in-kind
LVA Socorro Cnty Socorro PL, NM			x		70.0		x		Fed=approx FY95-96
Prendergast LibLitCtr Jamestown NY				100.0					
LitPgm Brooklyn PL, NY		100.0							
CRW-NY Public Lib, NY	4.0	87.0		6.0	3.0				
Moore LitCncl Cleveland Cnty L, OK	x								
GrtPlnsLitCncl Sthern Prairie LS, Altus, OK		12.0			82.0			6.0	Other=United Way
LitCncl LeFlore Cnt Buckley PL, Poteau, OK					x	x	x		Majority was LSCATitleVI
LEARN, Eugene PL, OR				x	xxxx	x	x		x=some
ReadersDevPgm Free Lib Phila, PA		50.0	18.0		8.0			24.0	Other=Mayor's Comm On Lit Phila.
Bradford Wyoming CntyLitPgm, PA		14.0	64.0		1.0	1.0	1.0	19.0	Other=civic orgs 2%, 3 United Ways 16%, local Head Start 1%
LVA-Kent Cnty, Coventry PL, RI					72.0			28.0	State/local govt, United Way, businesses, & individuals
LibLitPro, Greenville Cnty Lib, SC					x			x	Other=regular library budget
LVa-Sterling Municipal Libr, TX		52.0		1.0	36.0	5.0	3.0	4.0	Other=service orgs
LibLitCtr El Paso PL, TX	22.0	76.0						2.0	Other=Fundraising, Executive Spelling Bee
Proyecto Adelante Weslaco PL, TX		x			x				
LibLitPgms Harris Cnty PL, TX	23.0	25.0			52.0				
AdLitPgm of Andrews PL, TX		22.4	22.4		43.5		2.5	8.8	
Bridgerland Lit,Logan Libr, UT		4.0	9.0		61.0	2.0	4.0	19.0	Other=local library 17%, Trust 2%
LitPgm Newport News PL, VA		100.0							
ProjREAD Longview PL, WA		99.0					1.0		
LibLitPgmLfingLng, Seattle PL, WA		x		x					
LVA ChippewaPhillipsMeml PL, WI	3.1		15.7	2.6	64.4		2.6	11.5	Other=United Way
LitPgm Monroe/Peterstown PL, WV					100.0				Note: Had ALA/Bell Atlantic fam lit grants for 3 yrs
Cumulative Totals of All % Given	309	1,048	368	164	1,450	77	110	219	
Average %	**8.4**	**28.3**	**9.9**	**4.4**	**38.2**	**2.1**	**3.0**	**5.9**	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NCES and many state library agencies collect data according to the following "public library service areas." In which size population area is your program located?

LP7 (4)

	Under 1000	1000- 2,499	2500- 4,999	5000- 9,999	10,000 24,999	25,000 49,999	50,000 99,999	100,000 249,999	250,000 499,999	500,000 999,999	1 million plus	N.R.
Local Library Literacy Program												
LVA-Anniston Calhoun Cty AL								1				
Lit Council Hot Spring Cty AR					1							
Reading Together-Riv Valley Libr AR												1
Napa City Cnty Libr Pgm CA								1				
Alameda Cnty Libr Pgm CA										1		
Partners in Reading - San Jose CA										1		
Commerce Public Library Pgm CA					1							
LVA Marin Cnty - San Rafael PL CA								1				
Mesa Cnty PL Grand Junction CO							1					
LVA-Greater Waterbury CT								1				
Proj READS-Sussex Cnty Lit Cncl DE								1				
LVA-Wilmington Libr DE							1					
Proj LEAD - Miami Dade PL Sys FL											1	
Panhandle LibrLit Consortium FL				1								
Tampa- Hillsbrgh Lit Cncl/Cnty Libr FL										1		
Brevard Cnty Libr Lit Pgm/Cocoa FL												1
LifngLrng Svcs-Broward Cnty PL FL											1	
Cntr Ad Lrng-Jacksonville PL FL										1		
Lrng Ctr - Athens-Clarke Cnty PL GA							1					
Sara Hightower Rel Libr Pgm GA								1				
DeKalb Cnty PL Decatur GA										1		
LVA Elgin - Gail Borden PL IL									1			
Fam Lit Ptnrship Bensenville Libr IL					1							
Libr for Lit Lake Cnty Waukegan PL IL										1		
Lit Pgm of Mi City PL, IN							1					
LitPgm AndersonPL,IN							1					
Knox Cnty PL Literacy Pgm, IN						1						
Proj Finish Johnson Cnty PL KS									1			
Read Write/Now-Sprngfld City Libr MA								1				
Ctr New Amer -Jones Libr Amherst MA						1						
NewcomerFamLitPro Lawrence PL MA							1					
LibLitPro Thomas Crane PL Quincy MA							1					
ProjLit Howard Cnty Libr Columbia MD								1				
MARC LitPgm Greenville PL, MI							1					
FranklinLrngCtr Minneapolis PL, MN									1			
LLLLL Lexington BrLibr St Paul, MN									1			
CommRdrs Glnwd Lib Greensboro NC								1				
PlatteValleyLitAssnColumbus PL, NE					1							
BasicSkllor RdngESL Elizabeth PL, NJ								1				
LitNonEngSpkrs Paterson Free PL, NJ								1				
LVA Socorro Cnty Socorro PL, NM				1								
Prendergast LibLitCtr Jamestown NY							1					
LitPgm Brooklyn PL, NY											1	
CRW-NY Public Lib, NY											1	
Moore LitCncl Cleveland Cnty L, OK						1						
GrtPlnsLitCncl Sthern Prairie LS, Altus, OK						1						
LitCncl LeFlore Cnt Buckley PL, Poteau, OK					1							
LEARN, Eugene PL, OR								1				
ReadersDevPgm Free Lib Phila, PA											1	
Bradford Wyoming CntyLitPgm, PA							1					
LVA-Kent Cnty, Coventry PL, RI							1					
LibLitPro, Greenville Cnty Lib, SC									1			
LVa-Sterling Municipal Libr, TX							1					
LibLitCtr El Paso PL, TX										1		
Proyecto Adelante Weslaco PL, TX						1						
LibLitPgms Harris Cnty PL, TX											1	
AdLitPgm of Andrews PL, TX					1							
Bridgerland Lit,Logan Libr, UT							1					
LitPgm Newport News PL, VA								1				
ProjREAD Longview PL, WA							1					
LibLitPgmLifngLng, Seattle PL, WA										1		
LVA ChippewaPhillipsMeml PL, WI							1					
LitPgm Monroe/Peterstown PL, WV				1								
Totals	0	0	0	3	6	5	15	13	5	8	6	2
As % of Total Respondees (61)				*5*	*10*	*8*	*25*	*21*	*8*	*13*	*10*	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Which of the following are regular services/features of your library literacy program?							LP8
	Provide/Develop Book Collections for Ad New Rdrs	Provide/Develop Student/Tutor Lrnng Materials	Space for Classes/Mtngs Outside Groups	Provide Info &or Referral Services	Provide tutor trng/ direct instruction with own staff	Use computer tech for pgm mgmt purposes	
Local Library Literacy Program							
LVA-Anniston Calhoun Cty AL	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Lit Council Hot Spring Cty AR	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Reading Together-Riv Valley Libr AR	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Napa City Cnty Libr Pgm CA	1	1		1	1	1	
Alameda Cnty Libr Pgm Freemont, CA	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Partners in Reading - San Jose CA	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Commerce Public Library Pgm CA	1	1		1	1	1	Just beginning computer use for pgm mgmt.
LVA Marin Cnty - San Rafael PL CA	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Mesa Cnty PL Grand Junction CO	1	1	1	1	1	1	
LVA-Greater Waterbury CT	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Proj READS-Sussex Cnty Lit Cncl DE	1	1	1	1	1	1	
LVA-Wilmington Libr DE	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Proj LEAD - Miami Dade PL Sys FL	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Panhandle LibrLit Consortium FL	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Tampa- Hillsbrgh Lit Cncl/Cnty Libr FL	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Brevard Cnty Libr Lit Pgm/Cocoa FL	1	1	1	1	1	1	
LiflngLrng Svcs-Broward Cnty PL FL	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Cntr Ad Lrng-Jacksonville PL FL	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Lrng Ctr - Athens-Clarke Cnty PL GA	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Sara Hightower Rel Libr Pgm GA	1	1	1	1	1	1	
DeKalb Cnty PL Decatur GA	1	1	1	1			
LVA Elgin - Gail Borden PL IL	1	1	1	1	1		Note: Libr provides space for our (LVA) classes.
Fam Lit Ptnrship Bensenville Libr IL	1	1					
Libr for Lit Lake Cnty Waukegan PL IL	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Lit Pgm of MI City PL, IN		1	1	1	1		Book collections planned for near future.
LitPgm AndersonPL,IN	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Knox Cnty PL Literacy Pgm, IN	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Proj Finish Johnson Cnty PL KS			1	1			
Read Write/Now-Sprngfld City Libr MA	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Ctr New Amer -Jones Libr Amherst MA	1	1	1	1	1	1	
NewcomerFamLitPro Lawrence PL MA	1	1	1	1	1	1	Also, citizenship testing.
LibLitPro Thomas Crane PL Quincy MA	1	1	1	1	1	1	
ProjLit Howard Cnty Libr Columbia MD	1	1	1	1	1		
MARC LitPgm Greenville PL, MI	1	1	1	1	1	1	
FranklinLrngCtr Minneapolis PL, MN	1	1			1	1	
LLLLL Lexington BrLibr St Paul, MN	1	1	1	1			
CommRdrs Glnwd Lib Greensboro NC	1	1	1	1	1	1	
PlatteValleyLitAssnColumbus PL, NE	1	1	1	1	1	1	
BasicSkfor RdngESL Elizabeth PL, NJ	1	1		1	1	1	
LitNonEngSpkrs Paterson Free PL, NJ	1	1	1	1	1	1	
LVA Socorro Cnty Socorro PL, NM	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Prendergast LibLitCtr Jamestown NY	1	1	1	1	1	1	
LitPgm Brooklyn PL, NY	1	1	1		1	1	
CRW-NY Public Lib, NY	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Moore LitCncl Cleveland Cnty L, OK	1	1	1	1	1		
GrtPlnsLitCncl Sthern Prairie LS, Altus, OK	1	1	1	1	1	1	
LitCncl LeFlore Cnt Buckley PL, Poteau, OK	1	1	1	1	1	1	
LEARN, Eugene PL, OR	1		1	1			
ReadersDevPgm Free Lib Phila, PA	1	1		1	1	1	Not tutor training, but staff development.
Bradford Wyoming CntyLitPgm, PA	1	1	1	1	1	1	
LVA-Kent Cnty, Coventry PL, RI	1	1	1	1	1	1	
LibLitPro, Greenville Cnty Lib, SC	1	1	1	1			
LVa-Sterling Municipal Libr, TX	1	1	1	1	1	1	
LibLitCtr El Paso PL, TX	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Proyecto Adelante Weslaco PL, TX	1	1	1	1	1	1	
LibLitPgms Harris Cnty PL, TX	1	1	1	1		1	
AdLitPgm of Andrews PL, TX	1	1	1		1	1	
Bridgerland Lit,Logan Libr, UT	1	1	1	1	1	1	
LitPgm Newport News PL, VA	1	1	1	1	1	1	
ProjREAD Longview PL, WA	1	1	1	1	1	1	
LibLitPgmLflngLng, Seattle PL, WA	1	1	1	1	1		
LVA ChippewaPhillipsMeml PL, WI	1	1	1	1	1	1	
LitPgm Monroe/Peterstown PL, WV	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Totals	61	61	57	59	56	52	
% of Total (63 respondents)	**97**	**97**	**90**	**94**	**89**	**83**	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

If your pgm provides direct tutor training and/or instruction, which of the following components does the instructional program have?

LP9

Local Library Literacy Program	ESL	ABE	GED	Fam Lit	Wkfrc Wkplc	SmGrp Tutrng	1:1 Tutor	Off-site Instruct	Use Comptrs for Instruct/ Training	Use TV/Video for Instruct/ Training	Reg Collab Outside Agencies/Providers Yes	Which/Extent
LVA-Anniston Calhoun Cty AL							1					
Lit Council Hot Spring Cty AR	1			1		1	1	1		1	1	We're Laubach.
Reading Together-Rv Valley Libr AR	1	1		1		1	1	1	1	1	1	Laubach training/cons, recruitng DHS, Child Devpmnt, Tyson, Petit Jean, Wayne Poultry
Napa City Cnty Libr Pgm CA	1	1		1		1	1		1	1	1	Laubach mbr council; HHS, colleges, Head Start, EDD, area lit councils, et al
Alameda Cnty Libr Pgm Freemont, CA	1	1		1		1	1	1	1		1	School district, jails.
Partners in Reading - San Jose CA		1				1	1		1	1	1	Lit Alliance, Bay Area Lit, CA Li, CA St Libr, Laubach, LVA.
Commerce Public Library Pgm CA	1	1			1	1	1		1		1	We're a Laubach Council. Workplace Litfor Interstate Tire Distributor&Commerce Casino
LVA Marin Cnty - San Rafael PL CA		1		1							1	LVA, Laubach, local language consortium, BALit
Mesa Cnty PL Grand Junction CO	1	1	1				1	1			1	
LVA-Greater Waterbury CT	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Proj READS-Sussex Cnty Lit Cncl DE	1			1			1	1	1		1	
LVA-Wilmington Libr DE	1	1		1		1	1	1	1	1	1	James Groves Adult H.S., Vo Tech College, ABE classes, Salvation Army
Proj LEAD - Miami Dade PL Sys FL							1		1	1	1	LrnToRead Vols of Miami, Laubach (trng & trng materials, Assn Fl Laubach Orgs, Fl Lit Cltn
Panhandle LibrLit Consortium FL	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	
Tampa- Hillsbrgh Lit Cncl/Cnty Libr FL	1	1				1	1	1		1	1	Laubach,FL LitCltn,Assn FL LaubachOrgs,Read, Hillsbrgh Ad Ed/Lit,Hlsbrgh FamRdng Cncl
Brevard Cnty Libr Lit Pgm/Cocoa FL	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
LifngLrng Svcs-Broward Cnty PL FL	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1		1	Laubach, dozens of local agencies.
Cntr Ad Lrng-Jacksonville PL FL		1							1	1	1	Laubach-referrals, materials; local comm.coll-refrls to, HR-refrls from.
Lrng Ctr - Athens-Clarke Cnty PL GA	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	
Sara Hightower Rel Libr Pgm GA		1		1		1	1		1	1	1	
DeKalb Cnty PL Decatur GA												
LVA Elgin - Gail Borden PL IL	1	1			1	1	1	1			1	
Fam Lit Ptnrship Bensenville Libr IL												We're part of a coalition that trains.
Libr for Lit Lake Cnty Waukegan PL IL	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Lit Pgm of MI City PL, IN	1		1	1			1	1		1		
LitPgm AndersonPL,IN	1					1	1	1	1	1	1	Laubach, LVA(an affiliate), Anderson Schls, IMPACT
Knox Cnty PL Literacy Pgm, IN		1					1	1	1		1	Head Start
Proj Finish Johnson Cnty PL KS												
Read Write/Now-Sprngfld City Libr MA		1		1		1			1			
Ctr New Amer -Jones Libr Amherst MA	1					1	1	1	1	1	1	Schls,antipoverty grps, comm coll,CBOs,tenants assn/housing grps,ABE/ESL providers
NewcomerFamLitPro Lawrence PL MA	1			1			1		1		1	
LibLitPro Thomas Crane PL Quincy MA		1					1		1	1		We have open channel communictn w/colleges, Inst. of Health Pros.
ProjLit Howard Cnty Libr Columbia MD	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	ComActnCncl,AssnRtrdedCtzns, HowardComColl, Health grps,Foreign Info&RefarlNetwork
MARC LitPgm Greenville PL, MI	1	1					1		1		1	Laubach(mbr), DeptSoc.Serv,Eighcorp EmpAgncy,CommColl.
FranklinLrngCtr Minneapolis PL, MN	1	1	1			1	1		1	1	1	CBOs re emp & citznshp, colleges
LLLLL Lexington BrLibr St Paul, MN												
CommRdrs Glnwd Lib Greensboro NC	1	1	1	1			1		1		1	
PlatteValleyLitAssnColumbus PL, NE	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	
BasicSklor RdngESL Elizabeth PL, NJ	1	1				1	1		1	1	1	ElizAdult Sch, LVA Union Cnty.
LitNonEngSpkrs Paterson Free PL, NJ	1	1		1			1	1		1		
LVA Socorro Cnty Socorro PL, NM	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1		1	
Prendergast LibLitCtr Jamestown NY	1	1					1	1	1	1	1	Laubach, PIC, 75% referrals from various soc serv agencies. BOCES "Grasp"
LitPgm Brooklyn PL, NY		1		1		1			1	1		We are a stand-alone excellent pgm
CRW-NY Public Lib, NY	1	1		1		1			1	1	1	Riverside Language Pgm - Libr contracts with Pgm for ESL instructnl pgm.
Moore LitCncl Cleveland Cnty L, OK	1			1			1			1	1	
GrtPlnsLitCncl Sthern Prairie LS, Altus, OK	1			1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	Laubach
LitCncl LeFlore Cnt Buckley PL, Poteau, OK	1			1		1	1			1	1	Laubach
LEARN, Eugene PL, OR											1	LEARN pulls agencies together, refers their personnel, and serves as a resource.
ReadersDevPgm Free Lib Phila, PA	1	1	1	1					1		1	Mayor's Comm Lit, 204 ad lit agencies. RDP provides books, training.
Bradford Wyoming CntyLitPgm, PA	1	1		1			1	1		1	1	Laubach,Cnty Asstance Office referrals, Coop extension & Head Start family literacy
LVA-Kent Cnty, Coventry PL, RI	1	1			1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
LibLitPro, Greenville Cnty Lib, SC												Serv actually prov by Greer LitPartnership with which we cooperate.
LVA-Sterling Municipal Libr, TX	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	LVA affil,Lee Coll rfrl, GooseCrkSchDstrt fam lit, Exxon Chem Amer workplace lit 1990-94
LibLitCtr El Paso PL, TX	1					1	1		1		1	Ctnshp classes w/Diocesan Migrant & Refugee Serv.
Proyecto Adelante Weslaco PL, TX	1	1	1			1	1		1	1	1	
LibLitPgms Harris Cnty PL, TX												[Work w/several local] Laubach affiliates which provide the instr serv.
AdLitPgm of Andrews PL, TX	1	1	1			1	1	1	1	1	1	Laubach, college, county jail, Probation Dept, churches,sororities.
Bridgerland Lit,Logan Libr, UT	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	Laubach, Utah State, churches, soc serv agencies.
LitPgm Newport News PL, VA		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		
ProjREAD Longview PL, WA	1	1		1			1		1	1	1	
LibLitPgmLfingLng, Seattle PL, WA	1	1		1		1	1			1		
LVA ChippewaPhillipsMeml PL, WI	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	LVA affil. PubSchls, Soc Svc agencies, local technical college.
LitPgm Monroe/Peterstown PL, WV		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Totals	44	44	19	36	14	36	50	32	44	40	49	
As percent of total (56)	79	79	34	64	25	64	89	57	79	71	88	

LP10

If your program provides direct tutor training and/or instruction, please indicate the basic educational philosophy that guides it, indicating the curricular & instructional approach taken (e.g. whole language, phonics).

Local Library Literacy Program	Whole Language Base	Phonics Base	Eclectic/ Other	
LVA-Anniston Calhoun Cty AL	1			
Lit Council Hot Spring Cty AR		1		Also use language experience, whole language, neurological impress method, etc.
Reading Together-Riv Valley Libr AR		1		Also use whole language, ESL, and Life Skills, to individualize instruction.
Napa City Cnty Libr Pgm CA			1	Whole lang., phonics, sight words, language exper., writing, spelling, student goals.
Alameda Cnty Libr Pgm Freemont, CA	1			Some Freierian methodology
Partners in Reading - San Jose CA			1	Many approaches, including Orton-Gillingham for dyslexics. All training learner-centered.
Commerce Public Library Pgm CA			1	Language experience, phonics, sight words, word patterns, etc.
LVA Marin Cnty - San Rafael PL CA	1			Student goal-oriented program. Plus techniques to meet individual needs.
Mesa Cnty PL Grand Junction CO		1		But also whole language, basic books, multi-strategy books.
LVA-Greater Waterbury CT	1			
Proj READS-Sussex Cnty Lit Cncl DE		1		
LVA-Wilmington Libr DE	1			Also language experience, phonics, comprehension, oral techniques, etc.
Proj LEAD - Miami Dade PL Sys FL		1		
Panhandle LibrLit Consortium FL	1			
Tampa- Hillsbrgh Lit Cncl/Cnty Libr FL		1		
Brevard Cnty Libr Lit Pgm/Cocoa FL		1		
LifingLrng Svcs-Broward Cnty PL FL		1		Also extensive writing, student-run ed pgms, and other approaches.
Cntr Ad Lrng-Jacksonville PL FL			1	Anything that works and that we can think of.
Lrng Ctr - Athens-Clarke Cnty PL GA	1			Just shifted from phonics-based to whole language using sprinkling of other approaches
Sara Hightower Rel Libr Pgm GA	1			IBM "Pals" computer
DeKalb Cnty PL Decatur GA				
LVA Elgin - Gail Borden PL IL	1			LVA techniques for BR and ESL.
Fam Lit Ptnrship Bensenville Libr IL				
Libr for Lit Lake Cnty Waukegan PL IL			1	Emphasis on whole language, use LVA training w/some of own adaptations.
Lit Pgm of MI City PL, IN`			1	Answer unclear; appears eclectic but obvious personal preference for phonics.
LitPgm AndersonPL,IN			1	Trainingmostly centered around LITSTART. Use whatever works.
Knox Cnty PL Literacy Pgm, IN			1	Use diverse "tool kit" including whole language & phonics but not limited to them.
Proj Finish Johnson Cnty PL KS				
Read Write/Now-Sprngfld City Libr MA	1			Practical, learner-centered. Family literacy pgm aims to empower parents.
Ctr New Amer -Jones Libr Amherst MA			1	Holistic ESL methodology (whole language and oral communication skills stressed)
NewcomerFamLitPro Lawrence PL MA	0	0	0	Response - n/a
LibLitPro Thomas Crane PL Quincy MA			1	Combination of structured phonics and whole language.
ProjLit Howard Cnty Libr Columbia MD			1	Whole language used with all, phonics with a few.
MARC LitPgm Greenville PL, MI			1	MichMethod (phonics & lang. experience using VAKT). Goal- & student-cntrd lrnng pgm.
FranklinLrngCtr Minneapolis PL, MN			1	
LLLLL Lexington BrLibr St Paul, MN				
CommRdrs Glnwd Lib Greensboro NC	1			
PlatteValleyLitAssnColumbus PL, NE			1	But tutors are taught the Laubach Way to Reading.
BasicSkfor RdngESL Elizabeth PL, NJ	1			Basic LVA methods.
LitNonEngSpkrs Paterson Free PL, NJ			1	Tutor trnng combines whole language & phonics w/equal emphasis on rdng/wrtng.
LVA Socorro Cnty Socorro PL, NM	1			And ESLOA-LVA.
Prendergast LibLitCtr Jamestown NY		1		
LitPgm Brooklyn PL, NY	1			Wrtng based. Lrng organized in projs using info literacy & publshng to maximum.
CRW-NY Public Lib, NY	1			Rdng/wrtng dynamic. Literature-based,lrnr-cntrd. Wrkshps core of instrctn.
Moore LitCncl Cleveland Cnty L, OK		1		
GrtPlnsLitCncl Sthern Prairie LS, Altus, OK		1		But we're adding whole language.
LitCncl LeFlore Cnt Buckley PL, Poteau, OK		1		
LEARN, Eugene PL, OR				
ReadersDevPgm Free Lib Phila, PA	0	0	0	Response not useable.
Bradford Wyoming CntyLitPgm, PA		1		
LVA-Kent Cnty, Coventry PL, RI	1			Use LVA approaches and materials.
LibLitPro, Greenville Cnty Lib, SC				
LVA-Sterling Municipal Libr, TX	1			Student-centered instruction and approaches.
LibLitCtr El Paso PL, TX	1			
Proyecto Adelante Weslaco PL, TX		1		Laubach
LibLitPgms Harris Cnty PL, TX				
AdLitPgm of Andrews PL, TX			1	
Bridgerland Lit,Logan Libr, UT			1	Michigan Method, goal-cenyered, whole languge, phonics, other.
LitPgm Newport News PL, VA		1		w/word association
ProjREAD Longview PL, WA	0	0	0	N.R.
LibLitPgmLflngLng, Seattle PL, WA	1			
LVA ChippewaPhillipsMeml PL, WI	1			
LitPgm Monroe/Peterstown PL, WV	1			Some phonics, emphasis on writing.
Totals	21	15	17	
As percent of total responding (53)	**40**	**28**	**32**	

If your program provides its own instruction and/or tutor training services, what % LP11

of the instructional/training staff are: externally-recruited ABE pros and/or volunteers, librarians?

	ABE Pros & Vols	Librarians	Other	
Local Library Literacy Program				
LVA-Anniston Calhoun Cty AL	100			
Lit Council Hot Spring Cty AR	100			
Reading Together-Riv Valley Libr AR	96			
Napa City Cnty Libr Pgm CA	50	50		The librarian does 80% of the training
Alameda Cnty Libr Pgm Freemont, CA	90	10		
Partners in Reading - San Jose CA	100			100% - tutoring
Commerce Public Library Pgm CA	100			
LVA Marin Cnty - San Rafael PL CA	100			
Mesa Cnty PL Grand Junction CO	100			
LVA-Greater Waterbury CT	100			
Proj READS-Sussex Cnty Lit Cncl DE	100			
LVA-Wilmington Libr DE	100			
Proj LEAD - Miami Dade PL Sys FL	50	50		
Panhandle LibrLit Consortium FL	98	2		
Tampa- Hillsbrgh Lit Cncl/Cnty Libr FL	88	12		
Brevard Cnty Libr Lit Pgm/Cocoa FL	20	80		
LifingLrng Svcs-Broward Cnty PL FL		x	xx	xx=staff recruited from other areas
Cntr Ad Lrng-Jacksonville PL FL	100			
Lrng Ctr - Athens-Clarke Cnty PL GA	100			
Sara Hightower Rel Libr Pgm GA	100			
DeKalb Cnty PL Decatur GA				N.R.
LVA Elgin - Gail Borden PL IL	100			
Fam Lit Prnrshp Bensenville Libr IL				N.R.
Libr for Lit Lake Cnty Waukegan PL IL	100			
Lit Pgm of MI City PL, IN			100	One literacy supv (prof. teacher)
LitPgm AndersonPL IN	100			
Knox Cnty PL Literacy Pgm, IN	100			
Proj Finish Johnson Cnty PL KS	90	10		
Read Write/Now-Sprngfld City Libr MA	100			
Ctr New Amer -Jones Libr Amherst MA	100			Me!
NewcomerFamLitPro Lawrence PL MA	50	50		
LibLitPro Thomas Crane PL Quincy MA	100			
ProjLit Howard Cnty Libr Columbia MD		100		Reading specialist.
MARC LitPgm Greenville PL, MI	100			
FranklinLrngCtr Minneapolis PL, MN	100			
LLLLL Lexington BrLibr St Paul, MN				N.R.
CommRdrs Glnwd Lib Greensboro NC	40	60		
PlatteValleyLitAssnColumbus PL, NE	100			
BasicSkills RdngESL Elizabeth PL, NJ	99	1		
LitNonEngSpkrs Paterson Free PL, NJ			100	Center staff
LVA Socorro Cnty Socorro PL, NM	100			
Prendergast LibLitCtr Jamestown NY				Answer unusable
LitPgm Brooklyn PL, NY	90		10	
CRW-NY Public Lib, NY	100			
Moore LitCncl Cleveland Cnty L, OK	95	5		
GrPlnsLitCncl Sthern Prairie LS, Altus, OK	100			
LitCncl LeFlore Cnt Buckley PL, Poteau, OK	100			
LEARN, Eugene PL, OR	100			
ReadersDevPgm Free Lib Phila, PA	50	50		
Bradford Wyoming CntyLitPgm, PA	99	1		
LVA-Kent Cnty, Coventry PL, RI	100			
LibLitPro, Greenville Cnty Lib, SC				N.R.
LVA-Sterling Municipal Libr, TX	100			
LibLitCtr El Paso PL, TX	100			
Proyecto Adelante Weslaco PL, TX				Answer unclear.
LibLitPgms Harris Cnty PL, TX	100			
AdLitPgm of Andrews PL, TX		100		
Bridgerland LitLogan Libr, UT	50	50		
LitPgm Newport News PL, VA				Answer unusable
ProjREAD Longview PL, WA		100		
LibLitPgmLifngLng, Seattle PL, WA	90	10		
LVA ChippewaPhillipsMeml PL, WI	100			
LitPgm Monroe/Peterstown PL, WV	80	20		
Totals	4,524	761	210	
Average Percentage (of 56)	81	14	4	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Please check any of the following services that your program receives regularly from these four sources:
(a) state library agency, (b) local or regl library, (c) state or regl literacy resource center, (d) other entity.

LP12
p. 1 of 3

	State Advocacy				National Aldvocacy				Public Awareness				Policy Development & Panning				Statewide Conferencing				Professional Staff Development			
Local Library Literacy Program	a	b	c	d	a	b	c	d	a	b		d	a	b	c	d	a	b	c	d	a	b	c	d
LVA-Anniston Calhoun Cty AL								1											1					
Lit Council Hot Spring Cty AR		1	1			1	1			1	1									1				
Reading Together-Riv Valley Libr AR	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1		1	1
Napa City Cnty Libr Pgm CA										1							1			1			1	
Alameda Cnty Libr Pgm Freemont, CA	1				1		1									1	1		1			1		1
Partners in Reading - San Jose CA												1								1	1		1	1
Commerce Public Library Pgm CA	1	1	1	1	1		1		1	1				1						1	1	1	1	1
LVA Marin Cnty - San Rafael PL CA	1							1						1			1						1	
Mesa Cnty PL Grand Junction CO		1		1		1				1				1				1	1	1				
LVA-Greater Waterbury CT				1				1				1				1				1				1
Proj READS-Sussex Cnty Lit Cncl DE		1		1								1								1				
LVA-Wilmington Libr DE			1	1			1	1		1	1	1			1				1			1	1	
Proj LEAD - Miami Dade PL Sys FL	1						1			1	1	1		1			1			1	1	1		1
Panhandle LibrLit Consortium FL										1				1										
Tampa- Hillsbrgh Lit Cncl/Cnty Libr FL				1						1		1								1		1		1
Brevard Cnty Libr Lit Pgm/Cocoa FL	1		1		1		1		1		1		1		1		1		1					
LiflngLrng Svcs-Broward Cnty PL FL	1	1			1					1		1		1			1	1				1		
Cntr Ad Lrng-Jacksonville PL FL	1		1	1					1		1	1								1		1	1	1
Lrng Ctr - Athens-Clarke Cnty PL GA		1				1		1		1				1					1					
Sara Hightower Rel Libr Pgm GA			1					1		1				1					1				1	
DeKalb Cnty PL Decatur GA																				1				1
LVA Elgin - Gail Borden PL IL	1								1	1		1					1					1		
Fam Lit Ptnrship Bensenville Libr IL	1	1	1						1	1	1						1					1	1	
Libr for Lit Lake Cnty Waukegan PL IL	1		1						1	1	1	1							1			1	1	
Lit Pgm of MI City PL, IN	1		1		1			1	1	1	1			1			1		1					
LitPgm AndersonPL,IN																1				1				1
Knox Cnty PL Literacy Pgm, IN	1									1	1			1			1		1		1		1	
Proj Finish Johnson Cnty PL KS	1			1						1	1	1		1	1		1							1
Read Write/Now-Spmgfld City Libr MA	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1		1		1	1		1		1	1			1	
Ctr New Amer -Jones Libr Amherst MA	1			1	1			1	1			1								1			1	1
NewcomerFamLitPro Lawrence PL MA	1	1	1		1				1	1	1		1	1	1		1		1			1	1	
LibLitPro Thomas Crane PL Quincy MA			1				1				1				1				1				1	
ProjLit Howard Cnty Libr Columbia MD																								
MARC LitPgm Greenville PL, MI	1		1					1				1					1		1	1			1	1
FranklinLrngCtr Minneapolis PL, MN			1								1	1		1						1				1
LLLLL Lexington BrLibr St Paul, MN	1		1								1										1		1	
CommRdrs Glnwd Lib Greensboro NC	1									1					1		1				1	1		
PlatteValleyLitAssnColumbus PL, NE			1					1				1							1				1	
BasicSkfor RdngESL Elizabeth PL, NJ																	1			1	1			1
LitNonEngSpkrs Paterson Free PL, NJ	1	1				1				1				1				1				1		
LVA Socorro Cnty Socorro PL, NM	1	1	1		1	1	1			1	1			1	1				1				1	
Prendergast LibLitCtr Jamestown NY	1	1			1					1				1			1					1		
LitPgm Brooklyn PL, NY	1													1						1				1
CRW-NY Public Lib, NY											1	1			1	1			1				1	1
Moore LitCncl Cleveland Cnty L, OK	1	1	1		1	1	1			1	1			1	1			1	1			1	1	
GrtPlnsLitCncl Sthern Prairie LS, Altus, OK	1		1		1		1	1	1		1				1		1				1			
LitCncl LeFlore Cnt Buckley PL, Poteau, OK	1		1				1		1		1						1				1		1	
LEARN, Eugene PL, OR	1	1	1	1			1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1
ReadersDevPgm Free Lib Phila, PA		1		1			1			1		1		1			1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Bradford Wyoming CntyLitPgm, PA				1				1		1	1	1								1				1
LVA-Kent Cnty, Coventry PL, RI			1				1	1				1			1	1			1				1	
LibLitPro, Greenville Cnty Lib, SC																								
LVA-Sterling Municipal Libr, TX	1	1	1					1	1	1	1	1				1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1
LibLitCtr El Paso PL, TX	1							1	1	1	1			1					1				1	
Proyecto Adelante Weslaco PL, TX																								
LibLitPgms Harris Cnty PL, TX			1									1			1				1				1	
AdLitPgm of Andrews PL, TX		1				1				1				1				1				1		
Bridgerland Lit,Logan Libr, UT				1				1		1	1	1		1					1	1		1	1	1
LitPgm Newport News PL, VA										1				1					1			1	1	
ProjREAD Longview PL, WA			1				1			1	1			1			1		1			1		
LibLitPgmLflngLng, Seattle PL, WA												1							1				1	
LVA ChippewaPhillipsMeml PL, WI		1	1	1				1												1			1	1
LitPgm Monroe/Peterstown PL, WV	1	1			1	1			1	1	1		1	1			1		1		1	1	1	
Totals	31	20	27	16	14	9	17	20	17	35	26	26	5	28	14	7	25	9	28	25	15	23	33	23
% of Total Respondees (61)	*50*	*33*	*44*	*26*	*23*	*15*	*28*	*33*	*28*	*57*	*43*	*43*	*8*	*46*	*23*	*11*	*41*	*15*	*46*	*41*	*25*	*38*	*54*	*38*

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	Program Development				Curriculum Development				Evaluation/ Assessment				Training Tutors and/or Trainers				Applying Research to Practice				Fundraising/ Resource Dev			
Local Library Literacy Program	a	b	c	d	a	b	c	d	a	b	c	d	a	b	c	d	a	b	c	d	a	b	c	d
LVA-Anniston Calhoun Cty AL				1												1								
Lit Council Hot Spring Cty AR															1	1								
Reading Together-Riv Valley Libr AR	1	1	1	1			1		1		1				1	1			1		1	1		1
Napa City Cnty Libr Pgm CA									1															
Alameda Cnty Libr Pgm Freemont, CA		1				1		1		1		1		1				1		1		1		
Partners in Reading - San Jose CA							1								1									1
Commerce Public Library Pgm CA		1							1			1		1		1						1		1
LVA Marin Cnty - San Rafael PL CA	1							1	1			1					1			1			1	1
Mesa Cnty PL Grand Junction CO		1				1						1		1	1			1				1		
LVA-Greater Waterbury CT				1				1				1				1				1				1
Proj READS-Sussex Cnty Lit Cncl DE																								
LVA-Wilmington Libr DE				1				1				1												1
Proj LEAD - Miami Dade PL Sys FL		1						1				1	1	1		1				1		1		
Panhandle LibrLit Consortium FL	1					1				1														
Tampa- Hillsbrgh Lit Cncl/Cnty Libr FL														1										
Brevard Cnty Libr Lit Pgm/Cocoa FL														1										
LifingLrng Svcs-Broward Cnty PL FL																								
Cntr Ad Lrng-Jacksonville PL FL																								
Lrng Ctr - Athens-Clarke Cnty PL GA		1				1				1				1								1		
Sara Hightower Rel Libr Pgm GA		1				1				1				1				1				1		
DeKalb Cnty PL Decatur GA																								
LVA Elgin - Gail Borden PL IL		1		1		1		1																
Fam Lit Ptnrship Bensenville Libr IL								1				1				1								
Libr for Lit Lake Cnty Waukegan PL IL			1	1			1	1			1	1				1			1	1				1
Lit Pgm of MI City PL, IN																1							1	
LitPgm AndersonPL,IN		1		1				1								1								
Knox Cnty PL Literacy Pgm, IN		1		1		1			1					1							1	1		1
Proj Finish Johnson Cnty PL KS		1	1	1			1	1		1		1				1				1		1		1
Read Write/Now-Sprngfld City Libr MA		1	1	1			1				1					1			1	1		1		
Ctr New Amer -Jones Libr Amherst MA			1				1	1			1								1				1	1
NewcomerFamLitPro Lawrence PL MA		1				1				1												1		
LibLitPro Thomas Crane PL Quincy MA			1					1			1	1			1	1								
ProjLit Howard Cnty Libr Columbia MD																								
MARC LitPgm Greenville PL, MI				1				1	1		1			1		1	1		1					
FranklinLrngCtr Minneapolis PL, MN			1	1								1				1						1		1
LLLLL Lexington BrLibr St Paul, MN	1	1																						1
CommRdrs Glnwd Lib Greensboro NC	1	1						1				1				1				1				1
PlatteValleyLitAssnColumbus PL, NE							1	1							1									
BasicSkfor RdngESL Elizabeth PL, NJ													1			1								
LitNonEngSpkrs Paterson Free PL, NJ		1				1				1				1				1				1		
LVA Socorro Cnty Socorro PL, NM		1	1				1				1				1				1				1	
Prendergast LibLitCtr Jamestown NY		1				1			1	1				1								1		
LitPgm Brooklyn PL, NY				1								1												
CRW-NY Public Lib, NY				1							1	1												
Moore LitCncl Cleveland Cnty L, OK		1	1			1	1				1				1							1	1	
GrtPlnsLitCncl Sthern Prairie LS, Altus, OK			1				1				1		1						1		1			
LitCncl LeFlore Cnt Buckley PL, Poteau, OK	1		1		1		1																	
LEARN, Eugene PL, OR	1	1		1				1				1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1
ReadersDevPgm Free Lib Phila, PA		1													1	1			1	1		1	1	1
Bradford Wyoming CntyLitPgm, PA				1				1				1												1
LVA-Kent Cnty, Coventry PL, RI		1	1	1				1				1				1				1				1
LibLitPro, Greenville Cnty Lib, SC																								
LVA-Sterling Municipal Libr, TX	1	1	1	1		1	1			1	1	1		1		1		1	1	1		1	1	
LibLitCtr El Paso PL, TX			1				1															1		
Proyecto Adelante Weslaco PL, TX																						1		
LibLitPgms Harris Cnty PL, TX			1				1				1				1				1				1	
AdLitPgm of Andrews PL, TX		1				1				1				1				1				1		
Bridgerland Lit,Logan Libr, UT		1		1		1		1		1	1	1		1		1		1		1		1	1	1
LitPgm Newport News PL, VA		1					1				1			1								1		
ProjREAD Longview PL, WA		1				1				1				1	1							1		
LibLitPgmLflngLng, Seattle PL, WA			1	1			1					1				1								
LVA ChippewaPhillipsMeml PL, WI				1								1				1								1
LitPgm Monroe/Peterstown PL, WV	1					1			1	1			1	1		1	1	1			1	1		
Totals	9	27	16	21	1	16	16	19	8	13	14	22	4	19	12	25	4	9	11	13	5	25	9	19
% of Total Respondees (61)	*15*	*44*	*26*	*34*	*2*	*26*	*26*	*31*	*13*	*21*	*23*	*36*	*7*	*31*	*20*	*41*	*7*	*15*	*18*	*21*	*8*	*41*	*15*	*31*

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

LP12
p.3 of 3

	Data Collection & Analysis				Lending Library Resources				Grant Funds				Other	
Local Library Literacy Program	a	b	c	d	a	b	c	d	a	b	c	d		
LVA-Anniston Calhoun Cty AL														d=LVA
Lit Council Hot Spring Cty AR			1		1	1					1			
Reading Together-Riv Valley Libr AR	1	1	1			1	1		1	1				
Napa City Cnty Libr Pgm CA	1				1	1	1		1			1		d=Laubach, fed LSCA
Alameda Cnty Libr Pgm Freemont, CA	1	1							1	1	1		1	d=NIFL, BALIT, OTAN. Other=Network of Libr Pgms
Partners in Reading - San Jose CA	1						1		1			1		
Commerce Public Library Pgm CA	1						1	1	1					
LVA Marin Cnty - San Rafael PL CA	1					1			1			1		
Mesa Cnty PL Grand Junction CO		1		1		1	1	1	1	1				
LVA-Greater Waterbury CT				1				1				1		d=LVA
Proj READS-Sussex Cnty Lit Cncl DE				1										
LVA-Wilmington Libr DE						1				1		1		
Proj LEAD - Miami Dade PL Sys FL	1		1	1	1		1		1					d=FLLitCoal, Assn FL Laubach Orgs, and/or Laubach
Panhandle LibrLit Consortium FL	1				1									
Tampa- Hillsbrgh Lit Cncl/Cnty Libr FL						1			1					
Brevard Cnty Libr Lit Pgm/Cocoa FL					1				1	1				
LitlngLrng Svcs-Broward Cnty PL FL														Don't want this kind of support.
Cntr Ad Lrng-Jacksonville PL FL				1					1			1		
Lrng Ctr - Athens-Clarke Cnty PL GA						1			1	1		1		d-National Advocacy=Laubach
Sara Hightower Rel Libr Pgm GA			1			1					1	1		
DeKalb Cnty PL Decatur GA												1		d=GA Office of Ad Literacy, Grant Funds=LSCA
LVA Elgin - Gail Borden PL IL						1			1					d=YWCA
Fam Lit Ptnrship Bensenville Libr IL					1	1	1		1		1			d=comm college. All services WERE received, in past!
Libr for Lit Lake Cnty Waukegan PL IL			1		1				1	1		1		
Lit Pgm of MI City PL, IN						1	1		1	1				d=LVA, Laubach, Steck-Vaughn (materials)
LitPgm AndersonPL,IN							1							
Knox Cnty PL Literacy Pgm, IN					1					1		1		d=bus/civic orgs,soc serv orgs,pvt fndts,USDOE
Proj Finish Johnson Cnty PL KS								1	1	1		1		d-State advocacy=community college
Read Write/Now-Sprngfld City Libr MA				1			1		1			1		d=MA Coaltn Adult Ed/SDE; StLibr $ not regular.
Ctr New Amer -Jones Libr Amherst MA	1		1	1		1								
NewcomerFamLitPro Lawrence PL MA			1			1			1					d=State Advocacy Other=MACoaltn Adult Ed
LibLitPro Thomas Crane PL Quincy MA														
ProjLit Howard Cnty Libr Columbia MD														N.R., except "state funding provided during first 3 yrs"
MARC LitPgm Greenville PL, MI						1						1		d=LVA, Laubach; SDE (confcng); LSCA Title VI($)
FranklinLrngCtr Minneapolis PL, MN		1						1						
LLLLL Lexington BrLibr St Paul, MN					1							1		
CommRdrs Glnwd Lib Greensboro NC	1	1				1	1		1	1				
PlatteValleyLitAssnColumbus PL, NE			1											
BasicSkfor RdngESL Elizabeth PL, NJ														d=LVA Union Cnty, LVA-NJ
LitNonEngSpkrs Paterson Free PL, NJ		1				1								
LVA Socorro Cnty Socorro PL, NM				1		1	1	1	1	1	1			
Prendergast LibLitCtr Jamestown NY	1	1				1				1				
LitPgm Brooklyn PL, NY				1					1					d=Literacy Assistance Center
CRW-NY Public Lib, NY				1					1					d=Local Resource Center
Moore LitCncl Cleveland Cnty L, OK			1			1	1			1	1			
GrtPlnsLitCncl Sthern Prairie LS, Altus, OK			1				1					1		d=Laubach, Dept. of Ed ($)
LitCncl LeFlore Cnt Buckley PL, Poteau, OK						1			1					
LEARN, Eugene PL, OR	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1			1		d=OLI,OCCS, Dept Ed ($), LVA, Laubach (awareness)
ReadersDevPgm Free Lib Phila, PA		1	1			1	1			1	1	1		
Bradford Wyoming CntyLitPgm, PA				1		1	1					1		
LVA-Kent Cnty, Coventry PL, RI			1	1	1	1					1	1		
LibLitPro, Greenville Cnty Lib, SC														N.R.
LVA-Sterling Municipal Libr, TX		1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1		d=LVA
LibLitCtr El Paso PL, TX		1					1		1					d=ALA
Proyecto Adelante Weslaco PL, TX		1			1	1			1			1		d=federal
LibLitPgms Harris Cnty PL, TX					1				1	1		1		
AdLitPgm of Andrews PL, TX		1				1				1				
Bridgerland Lit,Logan Libr, UT		1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1				d=mostly Laubach; some SDE,LVA,LITStart, univ
LitPgm Newport News PL, VA		1				1								
ProjREAD Longview PL, WA	1	1	1			1			1			1		d=Fed LSCA
LibLitPgmLflngLng, Seattle PL, WA													1	Other=political updates
LVA ChippewaPhillipsMeml PL, WI				1		1						1		
LitPgm Monroe/Peterstown PL, WV	1	1	1		1	1								d=Tech College, LVA, Even Start & food stamps ($)
Totals	14	17	17	16	16	33	19	8	30	19	9	25	2	
% of Total Respondees (61)	*23*	*28*	*28*	*26*	*26*	*54*	*31*	*13*	*49*	*31*	*15*	*41*		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

What are the 2-3 greatest barriers to effective service in your program and in the extent and nature of your outreach? What local, state, or national assistance might help you overcome these barriers?

Alabama AL

1. Community perception of education.
2. Employment status vs. educational levels in job market.
3. Past history of job market in State of Alabama compared to economic growth and job market of today.

(LVA Anniston Calhoun County, Anniston/Calhoun County Public Library)

Arkansas AR

N.R.
(Literacy Council of Hot Spring County, Hot Spring County Library)

1. There is not a predictable source of income to support the program on an ongoing basis.
2. Childcare.
3. Transportation.

(AR River Valley Libraries for Literacy - Reading Together, AR River Valley Regional Library)

California CA

Reaching the "hard to reach," potential literacy students who don't want to be identified and so who don't seek out the program's services.
(Adult Literacy Program-Project Upgrade, Napa City County Library)

1. Media publicity is less than it used to be. Television awareness would be useful. A coordinated state effort to publicize the issue would be welcomed.
2. More communications with schools. I think a campaign that addressed children's needs might also then tap into adult needs. However, there seems to be a political initiation to maintain separate kingdoms/queendoms between K-12 and adult education.
3. Bringing learners into the debate at the level of decision making inside programs. Their experience can strengthen a program so it is attractive to adult learners.

(Adult Literacy Program, Alameda County Library, Fremont)

Lack of $$, shortage of tutoring space, lack of privacy for tutor/learner pairs. Inability to grow because we cannot add staff and space. We are maintaining our program at 150 matches because we cannot provide quality service to more. Too much staff time is spent on grant writing and reporting and fundraising.
(Partners in Reading, San Jose Public Library)

Limited staff hours--we don't have the time to do better outreach.
(Commerce Public Library Adult Literacy Program)

Adequate funding to do radio or TV recruitment. Local BaLit literacy organization is able to fund Bay area-wide TV outreach. National campaigns could provide more exposure.
(LVA Marin County, San Rafael Public Library)

Colorado CO

ABE/GED programs have a massive legislative contact network going. Library literacy programs using volunteers as trained tutors are overlooked. ABE is stressing funds for paid ABE teachers and programs. We often feel like "step-children" --as viewed by the certified staff of other programs even though our results are sometimes better.
(Literacy Program, Mesa County Public Library District)

Connecticut CT

1. Lack of funds to hire enough personnel.
2. Lack of space allotted to us by library.
3. Better access to funding.

(LVA-Greater Waterbury, Silas Bronson Library)

Delaware DE

1. The program has a waiting list of tutors in the Eastern part of the county. It also has a waiting list of students in the Western part of the county. Distance and lack of transportation are a problem.
2. The limited ability of the program to reach all those who need help.

(Project Reads: Sussex County Literacy Council, Sussex County Department of Libraries)

Funding.
(LVA-Wilmington Library).

Florida FL

N.R.
(Project LEAD, Miami-Dade Public Library System)

For 8 years the program has survived by grants. Because the position is not a permanent county position employees go on to a more stable position using this as a stepping stone. New employees coming and going sometimes within a year disrupt the program completely.
(Panhandle Library Literacy Consortium, Jefferson County Public Library)

Lack of money.
Lack of coordinated publicity.
(Hillsborough Literacy Council, Tampa-Hillsborough County Library System)

N.R.
(Literacy Program, Brevard County Library)

N.R.
(Lifelong Learning Services, Broward County Public Library)

1. Dependence on grant funding.
2. Lack of money.

If our program was not dependent on grant funding we would have the stability to provide services consistently. Each year for the past two years our Adult Education grant from the FL Dept. of Education has been reduced. With greater funding we would be able to staff our outreach site in one of our branch libraries more than the six hours per week it is now operating.
(Center for Adult Learning, Jacksonville Public Libraries)

Georgia GA

Funding.
Continued reinforcement for teachers, continuing education, staff development, student retention, recruitment.
Access to grants/funding.
Training programs (low cost, high quality)
Encourage other organizations to view and utilize libraries as collaborative partners.
(Learning Center, Athens-Clarke County Public Library)

The library is not recognized as a learning institute and is ineligible for some federal funding.
(Literacy Program, Sara Hightower Regional Library)

Georgia GA (cont'd)	Funding, funding, funding! Lack of staff for outreach activities and for keeping our program afloat is clearly related to inadequate funding. Not having a consistent, dependable source of support and having to rely on soft money means that no matter how successful the program is, it comes to a halt when grant funds are not available. In the current political climate it is apparent there will be less money at all levels available for lieracy programs. (Literacy Program, DeKalb County Public Library)
Illinois IL	Lack of qualified personnel, funding, and availability of childcare. Increased funding would be helpful. (LVA-Elgin, Gail Borden Public Library)
	Recruitment. Funding. (Family Literacy Partnership, Bensenville Library)
	Limited focus on a nationwide basis. State library verbalizes its support, but doesn't necessarily support its vocalizations. Government funding is decreasing. (Libraries for Literacy in Lake County, Waukegan Public Library)
Indiana IN	1. Problems and responsibilities of adult life, as well as lack of motivation, which prevent adults from making the necessary time commitment so as to reach their goals. 2. Lack of volunteer tutors who can make a consistent time commitment. (Many tutors are retired and go south for several months in the winter.) 3. Lack of personnel to assist the literacy administrator. 4. Lack of effective means of reaching low-level readers in the community so as to interest them in becoming students. (Radio ads would be helpful but cost money; PSA's may not be run as frequently as the program would like.) (Literacy Program, Michigan City Public Library)
	1. Lack of staff--we aren't able to keep the office open during each hour of the library's operation because there are only 2 staff people. 2. Too much dependence upon the LSCA Title VI grant. Because the program was funded by this grant for a very long time, the library has given very little financial support to the office beyond its generous in-kind contribution. (Library Literacy Program, Anderson Public Library)
	N.R. (Knox County Literacy Program, Knox County Public Library)
Kansas KS	Limited program funding restricts each Center's hours of operation, instructional personnel, and instructional resources. (Project Finish, Johnson County Library, Shawnee Mission)
Massachusetts MA	Funding, funding, funding. No stability in funding from one year to the next. Having to come up with some new project for many funding sources and fit all of the projects together when what's really needed is basic operating funds for basic literacy services. (Read Write/Now Program, Springfield City Library-Mason Square Branch)
	It's not outreach I worry about--we're very well known in the community! It's the waiting lists that concern me. If bilingual case management were available, it would make it easier for needy students to enroll and stay in class. (Center for New Americans, Jones Library)

Massachusetts MA (cont'd)	Barriers--Lack of time and uncertainty of funding from one year to the next. Assistance--better funding, professional development opportunities. (Newcomer Family Literacy Project, Lawrence Public Library) Funding is the major barrier to everything. Slight downturn in volunteerism. (Literacy Program, Thomas Crane Public Library)
Maryland MD	1. Personnel are spread too thin--must cover all branches, home-tutoring, school based family program, mobile services, community outreach. 2. Scope of program does not meet community demands. More funding is needed for personnel, space, materials. Better coordination of literacy services at all levels would help. (Project Literacy, Howard County Library)
Michigan MI	1. Lack of stabilized source of funding. 2. The time staff and volunteers spend raising funds locally just to minimally offer literacy services which would otherwise be used to provide more services to students, guidance and on-going training to volunteers. Solution: Designate funding for library literacy programs that specifically cover program staff costs. (MARC Literacy Program, Greenville Public Library)
Minnesota MN	1. Small staff, both of whom have to teach, therefore cuts into tutor/learner outreach and/or dollars for development. 2. Funding systems which stress traditional educational services and/or deliverers. (Franklin Learning Center, Franklin Community Library, Minneapolis Public Library) Getting any additional staffing assistance is the greatest barrier we face. We have a huge increase in adult class orientations to the library, provision of information services for these students and assistance with ESL learners and it is very time and labor intensive. As with most public libraries we face yearly reductions in the level of staffing to provide these service. Any ways in which assistance could include provisions for additional staff are crucial to providing quality services. (Linking Libraries & Literacy for Lifelong Learning, Lexington Branch Library, St. Paul)
North Carolina NC	Turf battles with other providers. Lack of funding/understanding--literacy materials are often consumables. Lack of staff training. (Community of Readers, Glenwood Library)
Nebraska NE	1. We are limited by the availability and instability of funds. Because we have been successful in the past in obtaining grants, the community does not give us any stable funding other than the United Way, which is subject to their success in fund raising. 2. Student retention. 3. Inability to diagnose learning disabilities. (Platte Valley Literacy Association, Columbus Public Library)

New Jersey NJ

Having enough tutors to work with learners, and funding to pay tutor trainers to run the literacy program. Paying tutor trainers, paying tutors might increase pool of tutors; being accommodating, flexible and timely in tutor trainer training schedule would be helpful.
(Basic Skills for Reading & ESL, Elizabeth Public Library)

1. Lack of potential volunteers--recruitment.
2. Continued funding.

(Literacy for Non-English Speakers, Paterson Free Public Library)

New Mexico NM

N.R.
(LVA-Socorro County, Socorro Public Library)

New York NY

N.R.
(Library Literacy Center of Prendergast Library, Jamestown)

1. Cannot go beyond pre-GED level, limits clientele, and discourages participants.
2. Unable to provide sufficient hours to comply with state, federal welfare regulations.
3. No funds for an outreach person.

(Literacy Program, Brooklyn Public Library)

1. **Staffing Qualifications -** It has been difficult to develop the required qualifications for literacy staff within the boundaries of the collective bargaining requirements of the union. Efforts are made to try to make the literacy lines and requirements parallel to those of librarians at equal levels, but because there are differences between librarian and adult educator training this is not always possible.
2. **Staff Training** - The institution needs to recognize that outside training opportunities need to be opened up to a wider range of staff in the literacy program. The literacy staff participates in the general training offered by the library. Often new staff coming into the program feel overwhelmed by the amount of library oriented training required in a short period of time. There needs to be a process by which the in-house training is spread out over time giving staff an opportunity to both learn about the library and to receive the vital on the job training.
3. **Line/Staff Supervision** - The literacy staff is under the direct supervision of the Branch Librarians. While the Branch Librarians are responsible for the overall operation of their branch, they do not have the knowledge of the literacy field that is necessary to supervise the program content of the literacy program. This causes confusion for the literacy staff and for the branch librarians.
4. **Outreach** - The library is beginning to recognize that the literacy staff needs to be involved in the community in a variety of ways including attendance at community board meetings. The literacy staff would like to take a more active role in developing budget actions/plans and to help incorporate the work that the library does in this area within the literacy groups in the City.

(Centers for Reading and Writing, New York Public Library)

Oklahoma OK

The greatest barrier to our program's outreach is the ongoing problem of reaching the non-reader in our community.
(Moore Literacy Council, Cleveland County Library)

1. Recruiting English speaking literacy students.
Making literacy empowerment a part of job preparation/training and then requiring and paying individuals in need to attend would help.
2. Retaining tutors. Perhaps national and state recognition of such volunteer contributions would help.
3. Providing effective family literacy programs. Collaboration with other agencies and some funding would help greatly.

(Great Plains Literacy Council, Southern Prairie Library System)

Oklahoma OK (cont'd)	N.R. (Literacy Council of LeFlore County, Buckley Public Library)
Oregon OR	1. Insufficient space in our library (city) and most county libraries. 2. The unwillingness of many librarians to look at development of adult language and math skills as an appropriate library activity. (LEARN Project, Eugene Public Library)
Pennsylvania PA	1. Lack of money for technology and books. 2. Lack of staff. 3. Need national recognition that funds for adult literacy are woefully inadequate, followed by high-profile measures (e.g. extensive, sustained PR blitz) to increase awareness and funding nationally, statewide, and locally. Lawmakers and funders, as well as the population at large, need to buy into remediation to prevent further literacy decline among adults AND children. (Reader Development Program, Free Library of Philadelphia) 1. Physical space - office is overcrowded. 2. Location - not in a major population center. Local concern and state funding to help solve the problem of lack of space. (Bradford-Wyoming County Literacy Program, Bradford County Library)
Rhode Island RI	Limited space in library, tutor recruitment, and funding. We need a secure source of funding from state or federal sources. Local support for a new or larger library would alleviate the space problem. (LVA Kent County, Coventry Public Library)
South Carolina SC	In Greenville County, transportation is a major problem. Good public transportation would make an enormous difference. (Literacy Program, Greenville County Library
Texas TX	1. Lack of a stable funding base--recognize that volunteer literacy programs are effective for adults with very low reading skills. 2. Progress/reaching goals take a long time to complete (1 year or more)--recognize that short-term solutions do not help adults with low reading skills. (LVA-Sterling Municipal Library) Barriers: Lack of personnel. Lack of funding. Assistance: Local: Full-scale fundraising efforts from community. State: TEA funding. National: LSCA funding, DOE funding, etc. (Literacy Center, El Paso Public Library) N.R. (Proyecto Adelante, Weslaco Public Library) A major barrier to service is that "soft" funding is used for literacy programs. Stable funding that did not rely on grants written on an annual basis would help. (Literacy Programs, Harris County Public Library) Although volunteers are the "heart" of the success of our program, we need trained teachers to help us teach, especially such subjects as Math & Writing. (We have a paid ESL teacher, which works well.) Our greatest need is more money to pay these people! (Andrews Adult Literacy Program, Andrews Public Library)

Utah UT	We live in a large area, geographically. There are few resources in some outlying areas. Our outreach tends to be weaker in those areas. Our state resource office seems to be slanted towards GED and other higher level programs. I wish we had ready access to more lower level, cutting edge materials. (Bridgerland Literacy, Logan Library)
Virginia VA	N.R. (Literacy Program, Newport News Public Library)
Washington WA	Local funding to expand the program - we need more space and additional staff time to reach more people who need literacy services in the community. We are working to develop a program with local agency who provides pre- and postnatal health care to families in need. We'd like to provide a literacy component there if we can get funding. (Project READ, Longview Public Library) 1. SPL is attempting to grow and expand in a city which has other literacy providers. There are "turf disputes" and communication problems. 2. The library is seen as the reading place and learners who are embarrassed or ashamed may never come here. They are intimidated. (Library Literacy Program/Lifelong Learning, Seattle Public Library)
Wisconsin WI	Stable funding is our only barrier. Literacy providers exist but because of so many partnerships it is hard to be a voice in our state. The quality of literacy programs varies so dramatically it is hard to unite. LVA at the national level is beginning to be a voice in government. This is good. (LVA Chippea Valley/Eau Claire, L.E. Phillips Memorial Public Library)
West Virginia WV	Uncertain funding - time is used for obtaining funding. (Literacy Program, Monroe County & Peterstown Public Libraries)

CONTENTS:
8. Library Culture

LC1 What opportunities and advantages (or freedoms and creativity) are possible in library literacy programs specifically because they operate within a library culture? (Q2, Q3, Q4)

LC2 What problems, if any, do you think library literacy programs in your state have because they operate within a library culture (e.g. lower pay scales than other library and education personnel, recruiting difficulties, unable to compete for local education funding, low status in the eyes of non-education library personnel, lack of high level management support essential for long-term success, etc.)? (Q2, Q3, Q4)

What opportunities and advantages (or freedoms and creativity) are possible in library literacy programs specifically because they operate within a library culture?

LC1
(2)

State Library Literacy Contacts

Alaska AK	N.R.
Arkansas AR	1. Can create individual learning program according to individual differences. 2. Become comfortable with library setting and aware of the variety of resources. Can participate in many [of these] programs (e.g. video) before learning to read.
California CA	The public library tradition of non-judgmental service to meet the needs specified by the patron is most important.
Colorado CO	No opinion.
Connecticut CT	N.R.
Delaware DE	Libraries have a unique opportunity to impact the prevention of literacy problems by promoting information literacy. Adults who seek out literacy training have determined a need for reading. Not all individuals are convinced that reading is entertaining, especially persons with reading disabilities. Librarians can help develop literacy skills by delivering the message that reading is empowering and by focusing on instruction in information access for everyone.
Florida FL	1. Less formal. 2. No required preregistration qualifications. 3. Not a structured adaptation of the educational system. 4. Less threatening to new returning adults than a formal school environment. 5. Choice of places to learn that will help to meet the learner's requirements and desires. 6. Community-oriented (sometimes closer to the geographic area of home or work where a literacy program is needed). 7. Confidential. 8. Year-round evening and weekend hours. 9. Adult new reader materials in a variety of subjects, reading levels, and formats. 10. Programs for the whole family. 11. Creative/ongoing marketing/PR. 12. Literacy Hotline/Helpline for all provider groups in the area. 13. Sponsor tutor/student/business recognition events.
Georgia GA	N.R.
Hawaii HI	N.R.
Iowa IA	Access to materials. Building, staff, programs already in place.
Idaho ID	N.R.

Illinois IL	The unlimited possibilities of instructional materials or resources on any topic that a student might wish or need to learn about to meet his or her goals. The key here is well trained staff and volunteers to take advantage of this creative environment.
Indiana IN	1. More neutral site. 2. Seen as non-judgmental. 3. Ready access to supplementary material. 4. Service culture. 5. Commitment to lifelong learning. 6. These library practices encourage librarians to meet needs of adult learners.
Kansas KS	N.R.
Kentucky KY	More help in getting materials of particular interest. Great flexibility in teaching, especially the ability to be informal.
Louisiana LA	N.R.
Massachusetts MA	These programs are generally very responsive to patron/community needs because they are so close to the population they serve. We need to listen more to these programs. **Their prime need is money for ongoing support. The issue is often how can I keep my library running and have a good literacy program too–especially if I don't have $ for both.**
Maine ME	Libraries have the resources (books, audio cassettes) and some have space. These need to be linked with appropriate (energized) literacy providers and their students.
Maryland MD	Any program that is geared toward helping people to help themselves is more productive and probably more successful in the long term. Library-based programs are programs of choice. Since many people with literacy problems had problems in the confining atmosphere of a conventional education setting, the library is less threatening.
Michigan MI	N.R.
Minnesota MN	Literacy is unbounded as to level, interest, future. Resources are varied; service is tailored. Linkages are vast. Expectations are at learner's pace. Service is holistic of individuals and their environments.
Missouri MO	Library literacy programs have the freedom to work with a number of different agencies as cooperative partners in community education. Since libraries have much to offer existing programs, their efforts are often well received. Also, the libraries have technological resources for both tutor and student use. This can be a major enhancement in current level of service to the students.

Mississippi MS	1. The library with its non-classroom environment presents a less stressful setting. 2. The library allows great opportunities for intergenerational activities. 3. Library hours allow for greater flexibility in scheduling literacy activities.
Montana MT	Family literacy connection.
North Dakota ND	Full access. Anonymity.
Nebraska NE	Don't know. Local library programs would have the answer.
New Hampshire NH	1. The funding source is less restrictive about the kinds of students that can be served, reading level, etc. 2. Reference and research techniques are taught more easily in a library. 3. Internet access is more common in libraries, currently. 4. Faithful patrons often volunteer for tutoring. 5. Library programs in NH tend to be small and [rest of text unreadable].
New Jersey NJ	N.R.
New Mexico NM	N.R.
New York NY	Students can be anonymous. Exposure to speakers and activities they might not otherwise consider. Resources that can be borrowed. Students can introduce family members and friends to a "new place" that will interest them.
Ohio OH	More materials available. Training in the use of the library to assist students with all their needs now and in the future. In Ohio, libraries are better funded and have the resources to provide a a variety of materials.
Oklahoma OK	1. Access to a wealth of materials and resources. 2. Network with other groups interested in reading (Center for the Book, library associations). 3. User friendly, open year round, access to computers, fax, etc. 4. Pro-active attitude of most librarians and the library community 5. Libraries exist for readers and are natural places to offer reading improvement resources. 6. Other education groups are being pressured to focus on literacy as a skill for employment. Libraries focus on reading as a personal development and as allowing people to reach their own goals and potentials. 7. Many literacy students had negative experiences in a classroom setting, and are less likely to return to a school setting to improve basic reading skills. 8. Libraries treat patrons as individuals, not classes.

Oregon OR	I see libraries as bound by rules as other organizations, and the step-by-step curriculum for adult literacy must be followed whether through workbooks or computers. The basic love for reading found in many library staff does translate into a superficial support for library literacy services, but not necessarily action-oriented support.
Pennsylvania PA	Possibly less regulations.
South Carolina SC	It doesn't have to happen in a structured or classroom setting.
South Dakota SD	N.R.
Tennessee TN	When a library is active, interested, and has the support and advocacy of the library board, the library environment is perfect for both the adult student and the youngster from birth. The materials are there, the space is there, and the avenue to greater awareness and information is there.
Texas TX	1. Access to materials and staff after work and school hours. 2. Access to different materials through books, tapes, video tapes, Internet. 3. Lack of a regulatory body to mandate size of classes and teacher training. 4. No stigma attached to poor readers as in the school/classroom environment. 5. Comfortable, confidential, non-threatening environment. 6. Flexibility. If something is not working, it can be changed immediately.
Vermont VT	Because library programs are voluntary, they offer a chance to learn in a nonjudgmental, nonthreatening atmosphere. There are no tests, no grades, no institutional historical barriers. The library is open to the whole family and may be used throughout one's life. So it is more relaxed and, perhaps, more practically-oriented.
Virginia VA	N.R.
Washington WA	N.R.
West Virginia WV	1. Wide variety of books, materials, resources, computers, as well as assistance with family concerns. Family literacy programs have been very successful. Childcare that includes helping raise the literacy levels of the child as well as helps parents learn how to help their children have been well received. The current educational philosophy is that the parent is the first teacher and an important factor in the success of the child. If the parent is unable to assist the child due to low literacy skills, then that child is doomed to failure. The library is a perfect location to provide the setting and materials to support a family literacy program. 2. Libraries are not bound by the restrictions that educators are forced to deal with (or at least not to the same degree), such as censorship and separation of church and state. In library programs the tutoring is geared toward the needs of the student. If the student is most interested in reading the Bible, then the Bible can be incorporated in the studies. Hours open at the library include evenings and weekends as well as summer hours. Most school-based programs end in the spring and begin again in the fall.

Wisconsin WI	N.R.
Wyoming WY	Inviting, family-oriented atmosphere.

What opportunities and advantages (or freedoms and creativity) are possible in library literacy programs specifically because they operate within a library culture?

Alaska AK	1. A wider array of relevant materials. 2. A (unreadable) from instructional materials to wide range reading materials. 3. A familiarization with the role and importance of a library in the community.
Alabama AL	Classes could and should be held in their facilities.
Arizona AZ	Don't know.
California CA	1. People who love books and advocate the joy of reading. 2. Large, free collections. 3. Centrally-located/non-discriminatory. 4. Non-threatening. 5. Whole family can be involved/learn together.
Colorado CO	Availability and accessibility of reading materials. Access to computers, online services.
Connecticut CT	They are in a position to reach the population segments that take advantage of free municipal services. And they are already designed to reach young children and families.
Delaware DE	n/a
Florida FL	N.R.
Hawaii HI	Family literacy. Training and technology.
Iowa IA	Expanded opportunities to learn due to availability of other materials.
Illinois IL	Programs operating in a library climate offer a very comfortable, alternative setting for literacy students who might have found school in their earlier years a very negative experience. Libraries because of the multiplicity of materials available in different formats (books, videos, computer software including CD Roms) can adjust to meet individual student needs and/or learning styles. Volunteers as well as students often find the library a more suitable place for tutoring because of safety factors in large urban areas. Students who must bring children with them because they have no or unaffordable day care are often allowed to have those children take part in activities occurring simultaneously in the children's services departments.

Indiana IN	Privacy. More stable revenue stream if included as budget line item.
Kansas KS	N.R.
Kentucky KY	1. Materials for instruction. 2. Research materials. 3. Computers. 4. Meeting and training space/non-school environment. 5. Community support. 6. Collaborative family literacy projects. 7. Program stability.
Louisiana LA	Statewide lending and information (electronic) network of information and materials.
Maryland MD	Open to the public; accessible to anyone; has an abundant amount of materials in comparison to the other literacy programs; is free/nominal fees; staff is knowledgeable and resourceful; people of all ages can be served; and most important is the opportunity for families to learn together.
Michigan MI	The shared values related to love of learning are the major advantages of literacy programs operating within library culture.
Minnesota MN	Stigma-free environment for learners (or it can be, more likely than a school). Teachers/volunteer tutors can use library materials as teaching tools. Libraries have information about other opportunities in the community and often have local job information available.
Missouri MO	Access to books and materials.
Mississippi MS	Time availability.
Montana MT	Especially appropriate for non-traditional students who may not fit into the educational establishment. The "approachability" argument.
North Carolina NC	Location - accessibility.
North Dakota ND	Libraries are the most logical places for literacy services because they represent a non-threatening, friendly environment and are located almost in every community.
Nebraska NE	Most libraries are easily accessible within communities, making it fairly easy for adult learners to get to those sites. Library hours generally include a wide range of time in terms of morning, afternoon, and evening hours; this is especially helpful for adult students who work during the day. Many libraries have a children's reading room; this could be used during

Nebraska NE (cont'd)	"class" hours for parents--this already happens, I know, within many library literacy programs: while the parent works with a tutor or instructor, the children have their own activities in a separate area. Access to resources is an obvious advantage. Along with this is perhaps increased funding sources to provide materials relevant to the adult learner. Such alternative funding is important in light of the cuts programs are facing.
New Hampshire NH	Libraries have public space and book and electronic media access in rural areas where these two items are often not easily accessible.
New Jersey NJ	Availability of a variety of books on a variety of levels including a specific core of literacy oriented books. Support of family literacy efforts.
New Mexico NM	They afford participants a degree of anonymity to participate, and a wealth of materials to use.
New York NY	N.R.
Ohio OH	N.R.
Oklahoma OK	Particular advantage is the truer appreciation of the clientele population. Libraries view these as people in need and not as stupid students.
Pennsylvania PA	N.R.
South Carolina SC	Many adult learners may feel threatened in the library environment, surrounded by books they can't read. Library may be too "busy" and someone may be seen receiving instruction. BUT, lots of resources are available.
South Dakota SD	Reading/literacy and libraries are synonymous. Training of staff on working with the adult new reader would be required. The library would be the logical first step for those in need of improved reading skills.
Tennessee TN	N.R.
Utah UT	1. Access to "support" reading materials. 2. Libraries are perceived as "adult" locations by some.
Vermont VT	n/a
Virginia VA	1. A basic reading program--provided the library has staff for it who have an understanding of how adults learn and strategies for teaching them to read. 2. Assist the SLRC in cataloging its holdings in MARC format and putting SLRC holdings online in the State Library database. Library personnel have the technical expertise for this.

Washington WA	Perceived by adult learners as not being a school.
Wisconsin WI	Libraries can serve the entire family. Schools separate adults and children when involved in academic growth and development. Family literacy efforts, in particular, seem to be effective when library resource and facilities are available.
West Virginia WV	1. A quiet atmosphere in the center of each community surrounded by materials already and staffed by those who "live" literacy. 2. Audio-video department. 3. New reader's collection.

What opportunities and advantages (or freedoms & creativity) are possible in your library literacy program specifically because it operates within a library culture?

LC1
(4)

Local Programs

Alabama AL

We are the only literacy program in the area. We are centrally located and tutoring sites are offered in all of the public libraries and community centers in Calhoun County.
(LVA Anniston Calhoun County, Anniston/Calhoun County Public Library)

Arkansas AR

Introduces non-readers to the library and its resources, not only for them but for their families. Library services are free and provide books, audio cassettes, videos, and computer access.
(Literacy Council of Hot Spring County, Hot Spring County Library)

Access to state and federal grant monies.
Access to materials provided by the state library.
Access to information concerning funding sources.
(AR River Valley Libraries for Literacy - Reading Together, AR River Valley Regional Library)

California CA

Access to materials.
Awareness of all the services provided by the library - familiarization with the library facility.
Tutoring in a library provides an academic atmosphere for learning.
Promotes use of library materials; learners are helped to get a library card if they don't already have one and are shown where to find materials.
Brings children into the library through services to their parents and special family programming.
Resource and referral to other educational opportunities and social services.
(Adult Literacy Program-Project Upgrade, Napa City County Library)

We do not have to address the homogenizing and standardizing elements that often direct teaching - i.e. testing and assessment. We primarily depend on portfolio assessment and staff intensive periodic review with students. We have no grading system or attendance funding formulas thereby some greater flexibility. We have access to wonderful materials.
(Adult Literacy Program, Alameda County Library, Fremont)

The program is highly visible because of its location in the library. Library staff help promote the program. The library's resources are readily available for learners and tutors to use. Much of the training takes place in a library community room. Branches provide tutoring space. Learners are encouraged to become library users right away if they are not already.
(Partners in Reading, San Jose Public Library)

Obviously we have access to a wealth of materials to use. We have **built-in credibility** because we're a service of the library. We're connected to other departments within the library and we can interact with and strengthen each other's programs.
(Commerce Public Library Adult Literacy Program)

Resources in the form of books for tutoring sessions. A friendly, non-threatening (academic) atmosphere. An on-going source of materials for students once they have left the literacy program.
(LVA Marin County, San Rafael Public Library)

Colorado CO

Non-threatening environment, use of library facilities and materials, contact with all types of clients, reputable organization if affiliated with a library, convenient location, surrounded by people who love to read and know its value in coping with life's situations.
(Literacy Program, Mesa County Public Library District)

Connecticut CT

1. Reference materials.
2. Newspapers.
3. Large general collection.

(LVA-Greater Waterbury, Silas Bronson Library)

Delaware DE

Delivery service to libraries for transfer of materials and reports.
(Project Reads: Sussex County Literacy Council, Sussex County Department of Libraries)

1. Location in center city.
2. Materials available.

(LVA-Wilmington Library).

Florida FL

1. Office is easily reached by phone, fax, e-mail, or in person because it is in the Main Library.
2. Office hours are regular and well-staffed because staff are paid librarians.
3. There are thirty branches that can refer adults to the program.
4. Referral information is readily available because of library sources.
5. Materials for training and tutoring are available free through the library.
6. Materials for "new readers" are available on their reading level at most libraries and are geared toward adults.
7. It is part of the Library's page on the WWW.

(Project LEAD, Miami-Dade Public Library System)

We can reach parents during children's hour and have programming for them at the same time.
(Panhandle Library Literacy Consortium, Jefferson County Public Library)

Direct contact with the public.
Opportunity to use library equipment.
Free courier service and photocopying.
Opportunity for volunteers to directly recommend purchases for library collections and equipment.
(Hillsborough Literacy Council, Tampa-Hillsborough County Library System)

A library environment lends itself to a learning situation.
(Literacy Program, Brevard County Library)

Resources, supplemental.
(Lifelong Learning Services, Broward County Public Library)

1. Strong support from the library administration leads to generous in-kind donations and additional financial support from the Friends of the Library.
2. Since libraries have traditionally been identified as locations to go to when you need information, many new program participants find out about CAL by asking a librarian where to go to learn to read.
3. The library encourages the literacy staff to take advantage of training opportunities and gives us time to attend, and also some funding.

(Center for Adult Learning, Jacksonville Public Libraries)

Georgia GA

1. Access to multiple materials, not just "literacy materials."
2. Being part of a library also means access to the latest technology--computers, satellite dish, Internet where students can share info with adult learners.
3. Libraries are neutral sites whose ultimate role is the fostering of ideas and lifelong learning. Also, they have the ability to open at least 70 hours a week.

(Learning Center, Athens-Clarke County Public Library)

A student remains anonymous and loses the fear of a classroom.
(Literacy Program, Sara Hightower Regional Library)

Libraries:
1. Welcome and serve all members of the community.
2. Offer a neutral, non-judgmental setting, unlike educational institutions which many new learners associate with past negative experiences.
3. Inspire confidence in those who distrust other governmental entities.
4. Provide a rich environment with materials at all reading levels, in varied formats, on a wide variety of subjects and presenting diverse points of view.
5. Contribute to new learners becoming readers, not just people who know how to read.

New Learners:
1. Become part of the literate community when entering the library, and are perceived by others as literate.
2. Can bring the entire family to use materials and participate in programs (i.e. story hours, community meetings, family nights, crafts), thereby promoting literacy.

(Literacy Program, DeKalb County Public Library)

Illinois IL

Access to large book collections, resource personnel, and study/meeting rooms.
(LVA-Elgin, Gail Borden Public Library)

Use of collection.
Use of staff expertise.
"Warm and friendly" environment.
Lifelong learning center mission.
(Family Literacy Partnership, Bensenville Library)

Space.
Materials.
Administrative support.
Technology support.
Limited funding.
(Libraries for Literacy in Lake County, Waukegan Public Library)

Indiana IN

Advantages are: availability of reference materials, space for tutoring, publicity resources via library newsletter, newspaper columns, etc., a variety of easy-reading materials in the youth department (some of which are suitable for adult literacy students), and audio-visual supplementary materials (such as instructional videos on understanding learning disabilities, etc.). There is also traffic of people who like to read, some of whom are potential tutors.
(Literacy Program, Michigan City Public Library)

The connection to the schools is not physical. The setting is very informal. The space the library provides is truly wonderful: office, meeting room, storage, classrooms, etc. Access to computer technology continues to grow. That provides excellent opportunity for instruction for volunteers and students. The library staff is dedicated to reading and treats the students and volunteers with great courtesy. Because we are in the library, we can operate year round with no difficulty. There is a great deal of interaction with staff in other departments which

Indiana IN (cont'd)

leads to a lot of collaboration and opportunities for learning. I suspect adults feel more comfortable walking into a library than they do a school. We really get some good help from our library, but it could be even better.
(Library Literacy Program, Anderson Public Library)

Libraries are where the books are and therefore provide tutors and students with a wealth of lesson planning aids on the one hand and real world materials on the other that aren't available in traditional ABE curricula. Things like photo-journalistic books that trigger language experience stories, or works of poetry that contain very few words with astounding impact. The biggest job in teaching adults to read is igniting a love of reading for its own sake, and libraries are great at that. Also, our librarians and circulation staff have become good at spotting nonreaders and making referrals.
(Knox County Literacy Program, Knox County Public Library)

Kansas KS

More people come to the library because it's a non-threatening setting. There are opportunities to find reading material for diverse interests and on various reading levels.
(Project Finish, Johnson County Library, Shawnee Mission)

Massachusetts MA

Supporting and developing comfort with using the library, taking out books for themselves and their children; taking advantage of collection in curriculum development; enjoying atmosphere that supports learning and exploration without conflicted feelings attached to it, such as schools have for many adult learners; supportive library staff.
(Read Write/Now Program, Springfield City Library-Mason Square Branch)

Our students have wonderful opportunities to interact in English with library staff members. Every month or so my beginning level ESL/literacy class is sent out of the classroom to take a survey of some kind asking staff members simple questions. This is the only interaction these students ever have with English speakers that feels "safe" and non-threatening. The library staff is very supportive and they seem to enjoy the change of pace. We also have access to far better facilities/equipment than we would have in another setting, and the central location makes it easy for students to get here, and easy for arranging activities downtown. As a teacher I find it very convenient that I can almost instantly put my hands on a picture book, a bilingual dictionary, a textbook, a low level reader, etc. here in the library. From the students' viewpoint, I think it is also convenient that they can find [such a wide variety of] services under one roof. There is simply no better place to learn to read and speak English!
(Center for New Americans, Jones Library)

If the library is used as an integral resource, rather than merely a backdrop for a literacy class, only then can its true value be realized. Teaching library skills along with literacy skills can empower the adult learner to become much more of a self-learner.
(Newcomer Family Literacy Project, Lawrence Public Library)

Library is neutral ground making initial student contact for help easier.
Access to materials, tutoring space and new tutors within library very helpful.
Literacy fits in with mission of library service and literacy programs can fit in well with a range of lifelong learning activities in the library.
(Literacy Program, Thomas Crane Public Library)

Maryland MD

Access to books, databases, information.
Non-threatening environment.
No classroom or "school" negative labels.
(Project Literacy, Howard County Library)

Michigan MI	The convenience of public library location--most people can find it easily. The library is a non-threatening place to meet compared to a school setting where failure has been experienced in the non-reader's life. Libraries are open evenings and weekends which makes it conducive to be tutored, pick up materials, get information. Students are treated as normal library patrons and not singled out as literacy students. (MARC Literacy Program, Greenville Public Library)
Minnesota MN	1. Transforming adults into researchers and information prospectors rather than mere readers/users. 2. Create love and use of knowledge. (Franklin Learning Center, Franklin Community Library, Minneapolis Public Library) For the Lexington Branch, it is easier to get funding from grants because the program is a collaborative using the schools and libraries to their best advantage complementing each other. Funders can see the dramatic need from statistics of educational and poverty levels in a specific area and the importance of lifelong learning that the library plays in a person's life. (Linking Libraries & Literacy for Lifelong Learning, Lexington Branch Library, St. Paul)
North Carolina NC	Integrated services (children's programs, access to computers, book discussion groups, etc.). (Community of Readers, Glenwood Library)
Nebraska NE	The public library provides a positive environment for learning and teaching. We benefit from the resources that the library provides, a neutral meeting site for tutors, and patrons who provide positive role models with their children. We benefit from the in-kind donation of space and utilities which is provided at no cost to us by the local library. Five meeting rooms are utilized by tutors and students, and larger meeting rooms are available for board meetings and/or recognition ceremonies. (Platte Valley Literacy Association, Columbus Public Library)
New Jersey NJ	Advantages to operating in a library culture are the following: people who are already trying to improve themselves see publicity about the program and hear about the program through word of mouth; learners feel comfortable in a non-school setting. Opportunities: It gives tutors insight into helpful books and media. (Basic Skills for Reading & ESL, Elizabeth Public Library) We can easily tap into its administrative/support services to handle book ordering, cataloging, and light clerical duties. We can benefit from grants offered through the State Library and US Department of Education. We are centrally located because of the library's location near downtown Paterson. (Literacy for Non-English Speakers, Paterson Free Public Library)
New Mexico NM	Convenience and free. (LVA-Socorro County, Socorro Public Library)

New York NY

1. Flexibility of time - Our library is open 9-9 and 9-5:30 on Saturdays. Tutoring can take place whenever the library is open.
2. Resources - Availability of extensive literacy-related collection.
3. Freedom - Possibly freedom from encumbering government regulations concerning education.

(Library Literacy Center of Prendergast Library, Jamestown)

1. Access to books, information, new technologies, laser disks.
2. Innovations and use of cultural richness of City (trips to Broadway, museums).
3. Collaboration with other nonprofits - health information and classes.
4. A strong student council that can set their own agenda and hold events.

(Literacy Program, Brooklyn Public Library)

1. Students in the Library's literacy program have access to the educational and cultural resources that are available to all patrons.
2. Students are provided with the opportunity to engage in a range of educational experiences.
3. The library provides a neutral educational environment that eliminates the stigma of returning to school.
4. There is prestige in being associated with The New York Public Library.

(Centers for Reading and Writing, New York Public Library)

Oklahoma OK

A library culture offers the advantages of resource materials and community recognition and support.
(Moore Literacy Council, Cleveland County Library)

1. Attracts high quality tutors who love reading.
2. Provides ideal shelving in the administrative area of literacy teaching materials.
3. Provides ample shelving in the public area for low-level titles available for check-out, and of course the system for making these available.
4. Neutral area for individual tutoring - no stigma.
5. Provides availability for computerized study programs.
6. Contains meetings rooms suitable for tutor training workshops.

(Great Plains Literacy Council, Southern Prairie Library System)

Non-readers are in an environment where reading is encouraged, materials of all kinds are readily accessible and a broad range of library programs are available (story hours, discussion groups, etc.).
(Literacy Council of LeFlore County, Buckley Public Library)

Oregon OR

Our cooperative programs strive to make the best use of all agency resources.
(LEARN Project, Eugene Public Library)

Pennsylvania PA

Access to all of library's resources.
Access to library's administrative support.
Access to library's positive reputation and credibility.
Librarians have expertise in evaluating books. Therefore RDP staff, by inclination and training, are able to evaluate and select the best materials for adult learners in Philadelphia.
(Reader Development Program, Free Library of Philadelphia)

1. Instant credibility when the program first began 15 years ago.
2. A network of libraries in our county library system for delivery of materials and tutoring locations.
3. Shared resources - such as copy machine, fax machine.

Pennsylvania PA (cont'd)

4. Office space.
5. Coverage of phone calls by library staff.
6. Support from library director and library board.
7. Visibility and publicity for sponsoring library.

(Bradford-Wyoming County Literacy Program, Bradford County Library)

Rhode Island RI

Our literacy collection provides tutors and students with a rich and wide-ranging source of information, tutor resources, curriculum-based texts, adult fiction for the new reader, tapes, videos, read-along books, as well as materials in specific areas such as employment, families, pre-GED, and GED. In addition, the literacy staff person is located in the library, providing assistance to tutors and students. Other advantages: a non-threatening place where tutors and students can meet, where student evaluations are administered, conducive to study and learning, library staff friendly and encouraging.
(LVA Kent County, Coventry Public Library)

South Carolina SC

1. A safe, accessible place for tutors and students to meet.
2. A logical seque to other library-related services that often are unknown to people who do not read.
3. A certain degree of anonymity, since there are lots of reasons to come to a library, but not that many to visit a literacy tutoring center.

(Literacy Program, Greenville County Library

Texas TX

1. Anonymity for learners who are ashamed of their low skills.
2. Strong community identity and validity for literacy program because it is located within the library.
3. Access to a wealth of materials to suit the needs of a diverse learner population.
4. Helps recruit volunteers, donors, and other program supporters.

(LVA-Sterling Municipal Library)

Advantages: Availability of materials (wide-range of interests). Family-centered environment allows parents to bring children with them to programs breaking cycle of illiteracy. (Parents serve as role-models.)
(Literacy Center, El Paso Public Library)

We can use the library facilities - copier, VCRs, computers, etc. We also use many of the library's books as supplemental reading and for reference.
(Proyecto Adelante, Weslaco Public Library)

Many people who enjoy reading like to volunteer their services at a library, particularly if their effort helps someone else learn how to read. Also, as a community institution which emphasizes learning and empowerment, libraries are effective literacy advocates.
(Literacy Programs, Harris County Public Library)

N.R.
(Andrews Adult Literacy Program, Andrews Public Library)

Utah UT

First and foremost, we can utilize the resources of the library, including space, utilities, equipment, and financial and legal support. The library affiliation makes public awareness easier. We also recruit students through the library. We can refer students to library resources. Library assistance has helped us professionalize our program.
(Bridgerland Literacy, Logan Library)

Virginia VA	We are able to recruit future employers to provide jobs for our students full or part time. Networking with social agencies, colleges, and schools plays a large part in the development of the literacy program. (Literacy Program, Newport News Public Library)
Washington WA	1. The library culture is an excellent environment to recruit volunteers committed to literacy. Most of our volunteers are regular library patrons. 2. The library is an open, friendly, and non-threatening environment for learners who have probably had negative experiences in school. 3. There are many visible role models of readers and families reading together in the library. (Project READ, Longview Public Library) Our infrastructure throughout the City allows us to be a comprehensive literacy provider in Seattle. Currently we're not, but we're growing. We have high visibility; this helps with fundraising and promotion of our literacy efforts. (Library Literacy Program/Lifelong Learning, Seattle Public Library)
Wisconsin WI	The library provides a learning environment for our tutors and students, materials are easily available for their use. Computers are available for those unable to use computers on their own. (LVA Chippea Valley/Eau Claire, L.E. Phillips Memorial Public Library)
West Virginia WV	1. Access to real books on subjects that interest students. 2. Students learn about researching information on a subject. 3. Access to children's books. 4. Availability of technology. 5. Students mingle with many literate peers. 6. Students feel comfortable in the library. (Literacy Program, Monroe County & Peterstown Public Libraries)

What problems, if any, do you think library literacy programs in your state have because they operate within a library culture (e.g. lower pay scales than other library & education personnel, recruiting difficulties, difficulty competing for local education funding, low status in eyes of non-education library personnel, lack of high level management support essential for long-term success, etc.)?

LC2
(2)

State Library Literacy Contacts

Alaska AK	Recruiting difficulties. Low status in eyes of non-education library personnel.
Arkansas AR	Lack of consistent sources of funding. Most programs will cease when federal funding is gone due to lack of available local funding. Local funds stretched to cover what public perceives as more important needs that affect the total population.
California CA	When we began in 1984 with only 27 participating jurisdictions, the biggest obstacle was the belief that schools should do literacy, not libraries. Now, 12 years later, literacy is offered by most of the leading jurisdictions and most of the funding is generated locally. There has been general recognition that public libraries have a unique role to play as partners in adult literacy/family literacy development.
Colorado CO	No opinion.
Connecticut CT	N.R.
Delaware DE	Lower pay scales than other library & education personnel. Recruiting difficulties. Unable to compete for local education funding. Lack of high level management support essential for long-term success. Problem of integration of library literacy programs into services normally used by persons who need literacy assistance.
Florida FL	Unable to compete for local education funding (political). Constantly/continuously evolving level of management support. Not enough paid staff in most instances to handle the constantly increasing need and demand for more trained volunteers. Recruitment/retention.
Georgia GA	N.R.
Hawaii HI	N.R.
Iowa IA	n/a
Idaho ID	Recruiting difficulties. Lack of high level management support essential for long-term success.
Illinois IL	Many of the library literacy programs in our state would not have priority status in their library settings if they did not bring resources into the library which are shared with or used by other patrons. Higher level management doesn't necessarily see literacy as a mission for libraries. Some educators have not been educated to know the value of libraries and ignore them when developing programs.

Indiana IN	Fewer teaching skills. Lacking skills in testing and evaluation. Some funding bodies don't see libraries as part of education infrastructure, therefore don't view libraries as places to educate--thus less likely to fund programs.
Kansas KS	N.R.
Kentucky KY	Lack of expertise. Extremely low funding. Transportation difficulties due to geographic features of state and lack of public transport.
Louisiana LA	N.R.
Massachusetts MA	Yes, we are considered the people who personify that well-meaning but ill-fated Ad Council ad "The only degree you need is a degree of caring!" We are much more, but are overlooked by both (sic) in our own profession. We continue to be the stepchild of education. The best programs have developed long-term relationships with other community partners, and offer multiple services of citizenship, driver's license exam, GED as well as ESL, ABE, and family literacy. I might add that Simmons College Grad School of Library Science is one of the few if any programs which offers a full course on library literacy and has for 8 years! **We need to get more library schools on board!**
Maryland MD	N.R.
Maine ME	1. Our primary problem is staff. Our small, rural libraries are often run by a single person and lack personnel resources to spend a great deal of time on this target audience. It's often all they can do to attend the customers who come in with expressed needs. 2. The second limitation is space. In small libraries space for seating is limited let alone an area that gives privacy for tutoring. 3. In our libraries with more staff and space, we see grass roots cooperation with local literacy providers--and this is growing.
Michigan MI	N.R.
Minnesota MN	In terms of basic literacy, problems are: 1. Many [libraries] do not see how they can serve new adult readers. 2. Many new adult readers are intimidated by libraries. 3. Transition of ESL, adult literacy to lifelong learning. 4. Library use is very difficult. In terms of literacy: 5. Most think of literacy as only basic. 6. Most think of it as a matter of training and not a matter of life and community participation. 7. The result is a literacy ghetto—their problem, their work—which happens when we fail to see ourselves all on the same continuum.
Missouri MO	Probably all of the above.

Mississippi MS	1. Lack of staff. 2. Lack of proper space (i.e. meeting space). 3. No stable ongoing source of funding to support library programs. 4. The fear the target audience has toward a place that seems directed toward an educated public. 5. The fear the adult learner has that someone will discover that he/she cannot read (i.e. in rural areas, where everybody knows everybody, this is especially valid).
Montana MT	Lack of resources generally for libraries. Perhaps a too-heavy reliance on volunteers.
North Dakota ND	Lack of sufficient staff and hours open.
Nebraska NE	Low wages - dependence on under-trained volunteers.
New Hampshire NH	1. Lack of day-to-day contact with other staff working in same field. 2. Some students are intimidated by the library at first--hesitate to make the first visit. 3. Lack of status with state adult education personnel, which may result in an inability to compete for state and federal money.
New Jersey NJ	N.R.
New Mexico NM	May not (justifiably?) be highest priority of some librarians. Community-based programs that make literacy training their only jobs often do it better.
New York NY	Unable to compete for most state and local funding. Lack of high level management support. Low status or certainly different status in the eyes of adult learning teachers.
Ohio OH	Don't know.
Oklahoma OK	1. Many Oklahoma libraries operate on very low funds and because of this, they cannot fully support a literacy program. 2. The libraries are understaffed and have many needs to fill. 3. Most library literacy programs are run by dedicated volunteers. Volunteers are wonderful, but it is hard to assure quality work, consistent staffing, consistent training, and accurate reporting.
Oregon OR	The library culture that accepts small units of service in the name of local control rather than looking to larger units of services for better funding and administration does hold back library literacy services. Beyond the small inadequate libraries, the funding for libraries in Oregon is adequate to more-than-adequate in some notable cases. Literacy tutoring services are generally low-funded services, that is, a small % of the book budget, and responsibility assigned to an existing position. The high prioritization of the library role of serving as popular reading centers (for well-practiced readers) may contribute to this. The vocal demand of heavy readers vs. the unheard voices of adult new readers is no contest in the choice of where to expend funds. The information and referral literacy role is accepted because it can be maintained with low funding.

Pennsylvania PA	Policy problems. Funding problems. Leadership and personality problems.
South Carolina SC	1. The statewide volunteer literacy organization disbanded several years ago due to a number of problems and issues. Literacy volunteer services are now more fragmented and are dependent on the strength of local organization. 2. We have found that heavy involvement in literacy training is beyond the capabilities of most of the state's public libraries due to **limited funds, staff, and space.** Currently, only a few libraries are actively involved in literacy beyond maintaining a collection of materials for literacy tutors and students. 3. Where there are strong literacy councils libraries are encouraged to be a part of it. 4. When services are offered exclusively by the education community public libraries are most often left out of the picture.
South Dakota SD	Materials available through public library but all staff of the literacy program are volunteers.
Tennessee TN	As far as I'm concerned, it is strictly personality-driven. Those who want to offer this sort of community service do it, those who are reluctant find all sorts of barriers.
Texas TX	1. Lack of funds. 2. Literacy volunteers and staff are not trained librarians and are operating within the library culture without adequate training in librarianship. Have to depend on library staff for help. Often library staff do not have adequate help or time to train literacy volunteers and staff in librarianship. 3. Cannot compete with schools and social agencies for funding. 4. All of the problems listed in the question narrative.
Virginia VA	N.R.
Vermont VT	Public funding for public libraries is extremely low. Many of our 206 public libraries are tiny and serve small population bases. Only about 30 librarians who learned on the job are also concerned with serving adult learners and their families. They are eager to support ABE tutors when contacted and are enthusiastic about providing programs to their students. They have been positive about reading discussion programs and family literacy programs developed by the Vermont Center for the Book. These programs are so popular that there is a waiting list due to the need for funding.
Washington WA	1. "Official educators" don't recognize library programs as adequate and significant from a substance (curriculum) point of view. 2. Lack of support for literacy programs from library directors. 3. Government officials unwilling to pay for literacy programs in libraries because they're offered by other organizations. 4. To receive funding from educational sources, libraries must have a proven literacy record.

West Virginia WV	1. All the problems cited in your example are operational problems for your library literacy programs. 2. The issue of wage is : We compete with education for staff and also with the personnel we need to pay a higher wage than the regular library staff wages. 3. Recruitment and retention of both students and tutors is also difficult due to poor transportation (no public transport in rural areas), poor childcare arrangement, difficult mountainous terrain, difficult weather conditions, and other factors. In other words, when often the student and the tutors/ volunteers are economically poor with little to no support systems, the program must become very nontraditional in order to retain them.
Wisconsin WI	N.R.
Wyoming WY	Certainly lack of human and material resources hampers efforts.

What problems, if any, do you think library literacy programs in your state have because they operate within a library culture (e.g. lower pay scales than other library and education personnel, recruiting difficulties, inability to compete for local education funding, low status in eyes of non-education library personnel, lack of high level management support essential for long-term success, etc.)?

LC2
(3)

SLRCs

Alaska AK	All library literacy problems are originated by other institutions. We haven't had luck in developing long term library literacy programs. [rest of text unreadable]
Alabama AL	There aren't any problems. Networking with St. Ed. agencies allow them the benefits they otherwise wouldn't receive.
Arizona AZ	Unable to compete for local education funding.
California CA	1. Lower pay and not regular library employees often. 2. Literacy staff often part time. 3. Many times literacy staff must write grants and fundraise in order to continue program.
Colorado CO	Low funding.
Connecticut CT	All of the reasons given as examples probably apply.
Delaware DE	n/a
Florida FL	All of the examples given.
Hawaii HI	N.R.
Iowa IA	Hidden -- lack of exposure, thus lack of commitment of support and monies.
Illinois IL	The major problems which libraries may have is their inability to access some funding. Educational funding sources often don't see libraries at their full potential in the delivery of literacy/adult education services. In rural communities, libraries may be the only suitable location for such activities. I must also admit that libraries have not in all instances been receptive to providing literacy adult education services either themselves or offering some of their services in partnership with the education community.
Indiana IN	Yes, all of these.
Kansas KS	N.R.
Kentucky KY	1. Lower pay scale and/or no fringe benefits. 2. Lack of support from library director and/or board of directors. 3. Lack of space in library facility for program expansion. 4. Less access to program-specific staff development.

Louisiana LA	Overcoming the larger obstacles - particularly in the rural areas (where need is tremendous) - like transportation (access, etc.).
Maryland MD	N.R.
Michigan MI	Such problems are generic -- not peculiar to library literacy.
Minnesota MN	All of these seem to plague literacy programs in general -- comparatively low pay, competition for funding, lack of high-level management support (in the case of programs that are part of a school district). One issue that plagues all literacy programs is the professionalization issue -- professional teachers vs. volunteers. Funders think you can do it all with volunteers.
Missouri MO	Don't know.
Mississippi MS	All of the above listed examples. They are necessarily seen by the State Workforce Council as strong providers.
Montana MT	Possible competition for library resources.
North Carolina NC	There are too few actual library literacy programs in this state to allow an appropriate response.
North Dakota ND	Lack of high-level management support. Lack of understanding on the part of library personnel, what their roles should be in the literacy movement.
Nebraska NE	All of the issues mentioned in the question are potential problems; however, how the library system implements their programs may make a great deal of difference in terms of negative consequences. It will be important to nurture a shared commitment within libraries in order for such programs to be successful. Likewise, it is vital to raise a common voice to decision-makers, locally and statewide, to raise their awareness of, and support for, such programs. One other rather simple problem: traditionally, the use of libraries has been considered a very "quiet" activity, yet much of learning should not be this way--there should be a certain energy involved in acquiring knowledge, etc. Perhaps programs should be located outside of the main library rooms.
New Hampshire NH	Lack of state funding for library literacy programs forces these programs to exist year to year depending on federal funds.
New Jersey NJ	Literacy programs have less flexibility because of bureaucratic regulations. Problem of literacy not being a core service in times of increasing fiscal restrictions.
New Mexico NM	Recruiting difficulties.

New York NY	N.R.
Ohio OH	N.R.
Oklahoma OK	We are unable to compete for Section 353 funds and limited funding elsewhere.
Pennsylvania PA	N.R.
South Carolina SC	I'm only aware of one specific program. It is grant funded and works closely with the local school district's literacy program. With this type of coordination there are few problems.
South Dakota SD	The only problem is in the "re-education" of educators. That librarians and volunteer tutors are part of the education community and have many skills to offer.
Tennessee TN	N.R.
Utah UT	1. Philosophical focus is not "instructional." 2. Lack of trained instructional personnel. 3. Lack of information in curriculum development and implementation processes. 4. Lack of space and space commitment. 5. Limited access (9-5). 6. Lack of instructional hardware/software. 7. Currently, not authorized to give "credit" for instruction. 8. Inadequate funding (quadruple need).
Vermont VT	n/a
Virginia VA	Adult education and literacy people suffer from the given examples as well.
Washington WA	No state level support for literacy initiatives.
Wisconsin WI	The size of the population in need of services is far greater than the capacity of all current providers combined can meet. In addition, the concept of "one size fits all" does not represent the population to be served. It is essential that all providers of literacy services and providers of support services (e.g. social services) work together to effectively serve that population.
West Virginia WV	Different regulations for employees in the same setting. The Dewey Decimal System is not user-friendly to some adults, especially those on low reading levels.

Please check any of the following problems your program has because it operates within a library culture.	Lower Pay Than Other Library Personnel	Lower Pay Than Outside Education Counterparts	Recruiting Difficulties	Trouble Competing For Local Ed Funds	Low Status In Eyes Of Non-Literacy Library Staff	Lack of Top Mgmt Support	Other (Please Specify)	No Problems	N.R.	LC2 (4)
Local Library Literacy Program										
LVA-Anniston Calhoun Cty AL				1						
Lit Council Hot Spring Cty AR									1	
Reading Together-Riv Valley Libr AR							1			Need more involvement/support from Board Mmbrs.
Napa City Cnty Libr Pgm CA				1						Concern about this in the future
Alameda Cnty Libr Pgm CA			1		1					Oth=Lack of class space, over-rely on volunteers, need more FT paid instructors
Partners in Reading - San Jose CA						1	1			Mgmt not supportive of us having own advisory board & 501(c)(3 status
Commerce Public Library Pgm CA								1		/Fundraising must be coordinated w/other libr fundraising priorities
LVA Marin Cnty - San Rafael PL CA				1						
Mesa Cnty PL Grand Junction CO				1	1		1			Oth=not associated with educ institution
LVA-Greater Waterbury CT	1	1	1	1		1				
Proj READS-Sussex Cnty Lit Cncl DE		1				1	1			Oth=county govt - receiving funds from Foundations
LVA-Wilmington Libr DE		1								
Proj LEAD - Miami Dade PL Sys FL			1	1	1					
Panhandle LibrLit Consortium FL		1	1	1	1	1				
Tampa- Hillsbrgh Lit Cncl/Cnty Libr FL				1		1				
Brevard Cnty Libr Lit Pgm/Cocoa FL				1						
LfingLrng Svcs-Broward Cnty PL FL	1	1		1	1					
Cntr Ad Lrng-Jacksonville PL FL				1						
Lrng Ctr - Athens-Clarke Cnty PL GA		1	1	1						
Sara Hightower Rel Libr Pgm GA	1	1		1						
DeKalb Cnty PL Decatur GA									1	
LVA Elgin - Gail Borden PL IL								1		
Fam Lit Ptnrship Bensenville Libr IL			1							
Libr for Lit Lake Cnty Waukegan PL IL		1			1	1				
Lit Pgm of MI City PL, IN				1						
LitPgm AndersonPL,IN	1	1			1		1			Other=lack of full funding & staffing
Knox Cnty PL Literacy Pgm, IN				1						
Proj Finish Johnson Cnty PL KS								1		
Read Write/Now-Sprngfld City Libr MA		1		1						
Ctr New Amer -Jones Libr Amherst MA		1					1			Other=constant threat of budget cuts, literacy not priority of town
NewcomerFamLitPro Lawrence PL MA								1		
LibLitPro Thomas Crane PL Quincy MA		1		1	1					
ProjLit Howard Cnty Libr Columbia MD		1		1			1			Other=limited in scope because of budget & space
MARC LitPgm Greenville PL, MI		1		1	1	1	1			Other=money for staff
FranklinLrngCtr Minneapolis PL, MN				1	1		1			Other=in times of tight $ literacy regarded "sidebar service" not essential
LLLLL Lexington BrLibr St Paul, MN							1			Other=purchase of lit materials must compete with other library needs
CommRdrs Glnwd Lib Greensboro NC				1	1					/There's high non-return rate for many of these materials
PlatteValleyLitAssnColumbus PL, NE				1						Some think we're part of library system and thus funded by the city
BasicSkfor RdngESL Elizabeth PL, NJ		1	1		1	1				
LitNonEngSpkrs Paterson Free PL, NJ	1	1	1		1	1	1			Other=inadequate space; short-term planning on part of library
LVA Socorro Cnty Socorro PL, NM									1	
Prendergast LibLitCtr Jamestown NY		1								
LitPgm Brooklyn PL, NY		1		1			1			Oth=lack respect of tradtnl ed provdrs-"you librarians don't know pedagogy."
CRW-NY Public Lib, NY		1	1		1	1				Pay=lower than Bd of Ed or CUNY staff but not CBOs
Moore LitCncl Cleveland Cnty L, OK									1	
GrtPlnsLitCncl Sthern Prairie LS, Altus, OK		1			1					
LitCncl LeFlore Cnt Buckley PL, Poteau, OK		1		1						
LEARN, Eugene PL, OR									1	
ReadersDevPgm Free Lib Phila, PA								1		
Bradford Wyoming CntyLitPgm, PA		1				1				
LVA-Kent Cnty, Coventry PL, RI							1			Other=lack of space within library but facility itself is overcrowded
LibLitPro, Greenville Cnty Lib, SC								1		Not applicable
LVA-Sterling Municipal Libr, TX		1			1		1			Oth=lit staff not trained librns causing some problms We're working to resolve
LibLitCtr El Paso PL, TX		1		1						
Proyecto Adelante Weslaco PL, TX		1		1						
LibLitPgms Harris Cnty PL, TX							1			Other=$ for library itself lmtd so pgm must rely on grants
AdLitPgm of Andrews PL, TX		1								
Bridgerland Lit,Logan Libr, UT								1		Our library affiliation is a plus all the way around
LitPgm Newport News PL, VA				1						
ProjREAD Longview PL, WA								1		
LibLitPgmLfingLng, Seattle PL, WA			1				1			Oth=non-rdrs don't want to enter THE City rdng instit;lots of outreach/pr needed
LVA ChippewaPhillipsMeml PL, WI					1		1			Oth=libr "staff" sometimes worries more about libr's rules than customers' needs
LitPgm Monroe/Peterstown PL, WV		1		1	1					
Totals	5	27	10	28	18	11	17	8	5	
% (of 58 respondees)	*9*	*47*	*17*	*48*	*31*	*19*	*29*	*14*		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE